DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 628 HE 006 220

TITLE	Separate Tuition Payments for Vietnam Era Veterans; Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Ninety-Third Congress. Second Session of H.R. 11134, 11545, 11681, 13183, 13184, 13185, 13433.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	182p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$9.51 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; Financial Support; *Higher Education; *Tuition; *Tuition Grants; *Veterans; *Veterans Education

ABSTRACT

This document presents hearings before the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, concerning separate tuition payments for Vietnam era veterans. Statements and testimony of interested group spokesmen and various Congressmen are presented with statistical data. (MJM)

SEPARATE TUITION PAYMENTS FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED101628

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 11134, 11545, 11681, 13183, 13184, 13185, and 13433

MARCH 28, APRIL 2, 23, AND 30, MAY 7 AND 8, 1974

Printed for the use of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Pages of all hearings are numbered cumulatively to permit a comprehensive index at the end of the Congress. Page numbers lower than those in this hearing refer to other legislation.

HE 006 272

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
34-170 WASHINGTON : 1974

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, South Carolina, *Chairman*

OLIN E. TEAGUE, Texas
JAMES A. HALEY, Florida
THADDEUS J. DULSKI, New York
RAY ROBERTS, Texas
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III, Virginia
HENRY HELSTOSKI, New Jersey
DON EDWARDS, California
G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, Mississippi
CHARLES J. CARNEY, Ohio
GEORGE DANIELSON, California
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
LESTER L. WOLFF, New York
JACK BRINKLEY, Georgia
CHARLES WILSON, Texas
JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
MARGARET M. HECKLER, Massachusetts
JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota
CHALMERS P. WYLIE, Ohio
ELWOOD HILLIS, Indiana
JOSEPH J. MARAZITI, New Jersey
JAMES ABDNOR, South Dakota
ROBERT J. HUBER, Michigan
WILLIAM F. WALSH, New York
CARLOS J. MOORHEAD, California
TENNYSON GUYER, Ohio

OLIVER E. MEADOWS, *Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEES

COMPENSATION AND PENSION

OLIN E. TEAGUE, Texas, *Chairman*

RAY ROBERTS, Texas
G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, Mississippi
JACK BRINKLEY, Georgia
JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
CHALMERS P. WYLIE, Ohio

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

HENRY HELSTOSKI, New Jersey, *Chairman*

OLIN E. TEAGUE, Texas
DON EDWARDS, California
GEORGE E. DANIELSON, California
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
LESTER L. WOLFF, New York
JACK BRINKLEY, Georgia
CHARLES WILSON, Texas
MARGARET M. HECKLER, Massachusetts
JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota
CHALMERS P. WYLIE, Ohio
JOSEPH J. MARAZITI, New Jersey
JAMES ABDNOR, South Dakota
ROBERT J. HUBER, Michigan
WILLIAM F. WALSH, New York

HOSPITALS

DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III, Virginia, *Chairman*

OLIN E. TEAGUE, Texas
JAMES A. HALEY, Florida
THADDEUS J. DULSKI, New York
RAY ROBERTS, Texas
G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, Mississippi
DON EDWARDS, California
CHARLES J. CARNEY, Ohio
GEORGE E. DANIELSON, California
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
LESTER L. WOLFF, New York
HENRY HELSTOSKI, New Jersey
JACK BRINKLEY, Georgia
CHARLES WILSON, Texas
JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
MARGARET M. HECKLER, Massachusetts
JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota
CHALMERS P. WYLIE, Ohio
ELWOOD HILLIS, Indiana
JOSEPH J. MARAZITI, New Jersey
JAMES ABDNOR, South Dakota
ROBERT J. HUBER, Michigan
WILLIAM F. WALSH, New York

HOUSING

CHARLES J. CARNEY, Ohio, *Chairman*

RAY ROBERTS, Texas
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III, Virginia
HENRY HELSTOSKI, New Jersey
DON EDWARDS, California
CHARLES WILSON, Texas
ELWOOD HILLIS, Indiana
MARGARET M. HECKLER, Massachusetts
JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
ROBERT J. HUBER, Michigan
WILLIAM F. WALSH, New York

INSURANCE

G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, Mississippi, *Chairman*

ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
THADDEUS J. DULSKI, New York
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III, Virginia
CHARLES J. CARNEY, Ohio
GEORGE E. DANIELSON, California
JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota
ELWOOD HILLIS, Indiana
JOSEPH J. MARAZITI, New Jersey
JAMES ABDNOR, South Dakota

CONTENTS

Page

Addabbo, Hon. Joseph P. ---- 2363
American Association of Junior Colleges:
Doerr Carl H., Jr., director, programs for servicemen and veterans ---- 2493–2496
Lawson, William, consultant for veterans' programs ---- 2495
American Legion:
Golembieski, Edward H., director, National Veterans Affairs and Rehabilitation Commission ---- 2349–2357
Mattingly, Charles E., deputy director, National Legislative Commission ---- 2349–2351
American Veterans Committee: Weil, Frank E. G., national secretary ---- 2499–2502
AMVETS: Hartley, Roney, national service and legislative director ---- 2497–2499
Bennett, Richard. (*See* Hofstra University.)
Biaggi, Hon. Mario ---- 2447–2449
Black, Theodore M. (*See* New York State Board of Regents.)
Boston College:
Silber, John R., Pr. D., president ---- 2469–2481, 2483–2485
Veterans' union:
Jankot, Jeffrey, student ---- 2438, 2439
Kalaher, Thomas, student ---- 2437, 2438
Brinkley, Hon. Jack ---- 2479, 2480, 2485, 2491
Brown, Hon. George E., Jr. ---- 2440–2444
Broyhill, Hon. James T. ---- 2380, 2381
Byrne, William N. (*See* Syracuse University.)
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education and Training (*See* Helstoski, Hon. Henry.)
Claire, William F. (*See* State University of New York.)
Cohen, Hon. William S. ---- 2362, 2363
Collatos, Charles N., Massachusetts Commissioner of Veterans ---- 2429
Conte, Hon. Silvio O. (*See* National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors.)
Danielson, Hon. George E. ---- 2379, 2385–2389, 2405, 2410, 2411, 2413, 2415, 2418, 2459, 2465, 2469, 2474, 2478–2483, 2485, 2486, 2491, 2492
Doerr, Carl H., Jr. (*See* American Association of Junior Colleges.)
Education and Training Subcommittee (*See* Subcommittee on Education and Training.)
Edwards, Hon. Don ---- 2379, 2383, 2384, 2404, 2405, 2410, 2413, 2415, 2457, 2459–2461, 2463–2466, 2468
Eggers, Melvin C. (*See* Syracuse University.)
Feldman, Stuart. (*See* National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors.)
Ford, Hon. William D. ---- 2361, 2362
Fraser, Hon. Donald M. ---- 2449, 2450
Golembieski, Edward H. (*See* American Legion.)
Hartley, Roney. (*See* AMVETS.)
Heckler, Hon. Margaret M. ---- 2421, 2423, 2426, 2427, 2433–2435, 2437, 2438, 2440, 2459, 2465, 2468, 2469, 2485
Helstoski, Hon. Henry ---- 2325, 2328, 2334, 2336, 2339, 2340, 2342–2350, 2356, 2357, 2359–2361, 2364, 2367, 2379, 2381, 2383–2385, 2387–2389, 2404, 2410–2412, 2417–2419, 2421, 2423, 2424, 2426–2429, 2431, 2433, 2435, 2437–2440, 2444–2446, 2449, 2450, 2452–2455
Hofstra University:
Bennett, Richard, executive assistant to president of Hofstra University ---- 2424–2428
Payton, Robert L., president, statement ---- 2424–2426

4

Holcomb, Howard E. (*See* National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities.)
Page
Huber, Hon. Robert J ---------- 2466, 2467, 2481, 2482, 2484, 2491
Independent Colleges and Universities. (*See* National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities.)
Jankot, Jeffrey. (*See* Boston College, Veterans' Union.)
Junior Colleges Association. (*See* American Association of Junior Colleges.)
Kalaher, Thomas. (*See* Boston College, Veterans' Union.)
Kazen, Hon. Abraham, Jr ---------- 2453, 2454
Ketchum, Hon. William M ---------- 2460–2468
Koch, Hon. Edward I ---------- 2435, 2436
Lawson, William. (*See* American Association of Junior Colleges.)
Mallary, Hon. Richard W ---------- 2363, 2364
Maraziti, Hon. Joseph J ---------- 2379, 2380
Mattingly, Charles E. (*See* American Legion.)
Mayer, James M. (*See* National Association of Concerned Veterans.)
Murphy, Hon. John M ---------- 2431–2435
National Association of Concerned Veterans: Mayer, James M., president ---------- 2358–2360
National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities: Holcomb, Howard E., director of Federal relations ---------- 2486–2491
National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors:
Conte, Hon. Silvio O., U.S. Representative from the State of Massachusetts ---------- 2389–2405
Feldman, Stuart, veteran coordinator, memorandums ---------- 2368–2378
New York State Board of Regents: Black, Theodore M., vice chancellor ---------- 2419–1422
Nooner, Morris (Bob) (*See* Veterans Administration.)
Payton, Robert L. (*See* Hofstra University.)
Pepper, Hon. Claude ---------- 2452, 2453
Rangel, Hon. Charles B ---------- 2445, 2446
Roncallo, Hon. Angelo D ---------- 2450–2452
Schroeder, Hon. Patricia ---------- 2454, 2455
Silber, John R., Ph. D. (*See* Boston University.)
Smith, Hon. Neal ---------- 2457–2460
State University of New York: Claire, William F., director, Washington office, letter ---------- 2367
Stover, Francis W. (*See* Veterans of Foreign Wars.)
Subcommittee on Education and Training:
Bills considered, agency recommendations ---------- 2325–2328
Chairman: (*See* Helstoski, Hon. Henry.)
Syracuse University:
Byrne, William N., director, Syracuse University Veterans' Organization ---------- 2405–2410
Eggers, Melvin C., chancellor ---------- 2381–2388
Thompson, Hon. Frank, Jr ---------- 2362
U.S. Conference of Mayors (*See* National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors.)
Vaughn, Odell W. (*See* Veterans Administration.)
Veterans Administration:
Agency reports on bills ---------- 2327–2333
Nooner, Morris (Bob), director, education and rehabilitation service ---------- 2335
Vaughn, Odell W., chief benefits director ---------- 2329–2342, 2344–2349
Veterans of Foreign Wars: Stover, Francis W., director, national legislative service ---------- 2502–2504
Walsh, Hon. William F ---------- 2336–2340, 2343, 2347, 2348, 2357, 2359, 2360, 2364–2367, 2379, 2381, 2388, 2389, 2418, 2421, 2422, 2427, 2428, 2435, 2438–2440, 2459, 2460, 2468, 2482–2484, 2492, 2499
Weil, Frank E. G. (*See* American Veterans Committee.)
Wilson, Hon. Bob ---------- 2411, 2412
Winn, Hon. Larry, Jr ---------- 2445
Wolff, Hon. Lester L ---------- 2334–2336, 2338, 2342, 2343, 2346, 2348, 2349, 2356, 2378, 2379, 2383, 2387, 2388, 2413–2418, 2423, 2424, 2429, 2493, 2495–2499, 2502–2504
Wylie, Hon. Chalmers P ---------- 2459, 2465, 2466, 2480, 2481
Zwach, Hon. John M ---------- 2336, 2340–2342, 2356, 2357, 2359

SEPARATE TUITION PAYMENTS FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 10:10 a.m., in room 343, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Henry Helstoski (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. The meeting will come to order.

At the conclusion of our hearings on the omnibus veterans' education bill, H.R. 12628, which passed the House February 19, we agreed to give further consideration to bills proposing a separate tuition payment in addition to the regular monthly educational allowance and that is the purpose of this committee hearing this morning.

Without objection, the text of H.R. 11134, along with a list of pending identical bills and other pertinent data will be placed in the record at this point.

[The material referred to follows:]

BILLS CONSIDERED, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING

H.R. 11134 AND IDENTICAL BILLS BY NUMBER

H.R. 11134.—Mr. Walsh.

H.R. 11545.—Mr. Walsh (for himself, Mr. Helstoski, Ms. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Maraziti, and Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas).

H.R. 11681.—Mr. Walsh (for himself, Mr. Danielson, Mr. Peyser, Mr. Fish, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Horton, Mr. Gilman, Mrs. Chisholm, and Mr. Mitchell of New York).

H.R. 13183.—Mr. Wolff (for himself, Mr. Walsh, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Carney of Ohio, Mr. Roe, Mr. Roncalio of Wyoming, Mr. Rose, Mr. Rosenthal, Mrs. Schroeder, Mr. Studds, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Winn, Mr. Mitchell of New York and Mrs. Chisholm).

H.R. 13184.—Mr. Wolff (for himself, Mr. Walsh, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Carney of Ohio, Ms. Abzug, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Bergland, Mr. Boland, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Clay, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Cohen, Mrs. Collins of Illinois, Mr. Conte, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Cronin, Mr. Danielson, Mr. Drinan, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Eilberg, Mr. Esch, Mr. Morgan, and Mr. Murtha).

H.R. 13185.—Mr. Wolff (for himself, Mr. Walsh, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Carney of Ohio, Mr. Fish, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Grover, Mr. Harrington, Ms. Holtzman, Mr. Horton, Mr. Kazan, Mr. Koch, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Maraziti, Mr. Minish, Mr. Mitchell of Maryland, Mr. Nix, Mr. Owens, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Peyser, Mr. Podell, Mr. Rangel, and Mr. Regula).

H.R. 13433.—Mr. Wolff (for himself, Mr. Walsh, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Carney of Ohio, Mr. Ford, Mr. Gunter, Mr. Mallary, Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania, Mr. Sandman, Mr. Sarasin, Mr. Seiberling, and Mr. Thompson of New Jersey).

BILLS CONSIDERED, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING

H.R. 11134 AND IDENTICAL BILLS BY AUTHOR OR CO-SPONSOR (ALL MEMBERS ARE CO-SPONSORS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED)

Abzug, Ms. Bella	H.R. 13184
Addabbo, Joseph P	H.R. 13184
Badillo, Herman	H.R. 13184
Bergland, Bob	H.R. 13184
Biaggi, Marco	H.R. 11681
Boland, Edward P	H.R. 13184
Brown, George E. Jr. (Calif.)	H.R. 13184
Carney, Charles J	H.R. 13183, 13184, 13185, 13433
Chisholm, Mrs. Shirley	H.R. 11681, 13183
Clay, William (Bill)	H.R. 13184
Cleveland, James C	H.R. 13184
Cohen, William S	H.R. 13184
Collins, Cardiss (Ill.)	H.R. 13184
Conte, Silvio	H.R. 13184
Conyers, John, Jr	H.R. 13184
Cronin, Paul W	H.R. 13184
Danielson, George	H.R. 11681, 13184
Drinan, Robert F	H.R. 13184
Edwards, Don (Calif.)	H.R. 11545, 13184
Eilberg, Joshua	H.R. 13184
Esch, Marvin L	H.R. 13184
Fish, Hamilton, Jr	H.R. 11681, 13185
Ford, William D	H.R. 13433
Fraser, Donald	H.R. 13185
Gilman, Benjamin A	H.R. 11545, 11681, 13185
Grover, James R., Jr	H.R. 13185
Gunter, Bill	H.R. 13433
Harrington, Michael	H.R. 13185
Heckler, Mrs. Margaret	H.R. 11545, 13183, 13184, 13185, 13433
Hechtoski, Henry	H.R. 11545, 13183, 13184, 13185 13433
Holtzman, Ms. Elizabeth	H.R. 13185
Horton, Frank	H.R. 11681, 13185
Kazen, Abraham, Jr	H.R. 13185
Koch, Edward I	H.R. 13185
Kyros, Peter N	H.R. 13185
Mallary, Richard W	H.R. 13433
Maraziti, Joseph J	H.R. 11545, 13185
Minish, Joseph G	H.R. 13185
Mitchell, Parren J. (Md.)	H.R. 13185
Mitchell, Donald J. (N.Y.)	H.R. 11681, 13183
Moorhead, Wm. S. (Pa.)	H.R. 13433
Morgan, Thomas E	H.R. 13184
Murtha, John P	H.R. 13184
Nix, Robert N. C	H.R. 13185
Owens, Wayne	H.R. 13185
Pepper, Claude	H.R. 13185
Peyser, Peter A	H.R. 11681, 13185
Podell, Bertram L	H.R. 13185
Rangel, Charles B	H.R. 11681, 13185
Regula, Ralph	H.R. 13185
Roe, Robert A	H.R. 13183
Roncalio, Teno (Wyoming)	H.R. 13183
Rose, Charles	H.R. 13183
Rosenthal, Benjamin S	H.R. 13183
Sandman, Charles W., Jr	H.R. 13433
Sarasin, Ronald A	H.R. 13433
Schroeder, Ms. Patricia	H.R. 13183
Seiberling, John F	H.R. 13433
Studds, Gerry E	H.R. 13183

Tiernan, Robert O	H.R. 13183
Thompson, Frank, Jr., (N.J.)	H.R. 13433
Walsh, William F	H.R. 11134 (author), 11545 (author), 11681 (author), 13183, 13184, 13185, 13433
Wilson, Charles (Texas)	H.R. 11545
Winn, Larry, Jr	H.R. 13183
Wolff, Lester L	H.R. 13183 (author), 13184 (author), 13185(author), 13433 (author)

[H.R. 11134, 93d Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize additional payments to eligible veterans to partially defray the cost of tuition

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1682 of title 38, United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) In addition to the educational assistance allowance payable to veterans under this chapter (except in the case of servicemen on active duty, programs pursued on less than a half-time basis or flight training) there shall be paid to each veteran an additional educational assistance allowance in an amount representing the cost of his tuition which exceeds $419 for an ordinary school year, but in no event shall such payment exceed $500 for an ordinary school year.".

[No. 99]

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., December 13, 1973.

Hon. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will respond to your request for the views of the Veterans' Administration on H.R. 1134, 93d Congress, a bill "To amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize additional payments to eligible veterans to partially defray the cost of tuition."

The measure would amend section 1682 of title 38 to add a new subsection (d) which would provide, in addition to the educational assistance allowance already granted veterans, a tuition payment plan. Payments, which would be made directly to the eligible veteran, would be in an amount representing the cost of his tuition exceeding $419 for an ordinary school year, but no payment to the veteran could exceed $500 for an ordinary school year. This benefit would be extended to veterans enrolled in programs of education on a half-time or more basis, but not to veterans pursuing programs of flight training, veterans pursuing programs on less than a half-time basis, or to servicemen on active duty pursuing programs of education under the GI bill.

Historically, under the World War II GI bill program, the cost of a veteran's tuition, fees, books, supplies, and equipment, up to $500 for an ordinary school year, was paid directly to the educational institution. This required contracting with the schools, a method found most unsatisfactory and subject to much abuse.

A House select committee made a far-ranging study of the overall operations of the World War II program which turned up many abuses of the tuition payment system, including veteran enrollment aimed at financial gain rather than serious educational intent with resulting exploitation of the veteran as well as the Government. As a result, when the Congress enacted the Korean conflict program, as well as current law, it inserted a direct payment system under which the veteran was paid an educational assistance allowance designed to meet, in part, the expense of the veteran's subsistence, tuition, fees, books, supplies, and equipment. This had the desirable effect of requiring the veteran to have a stake in his own education.

We firmly believe that return to a tuition repayment system, even though the payment would be made to the veteran instead of the school, would again open the door to the many abuses which occurred in the earlier program.

We would like to point out that the bill does not provide for any reimbursement to the VA if the veteran withdraws from the school after receiving his tuition payment, but before the expiration of the school's refund period. This could mean, for example, that a veteran could enroll in school on September 13 (the start of the school year), receive his $680 tuition payment, withdraw from school on September 24, and be entitled to a refund from the school of up to 80 percent of the tuition. Since the veteran's entitlement is only chargeable against the subsistence payment, and not tuition, the veteran would be financially enriched without charge to his entitlement. There is also no provision which would prevent this from occurring again.

It is estimated that enactment of H.R. 11134 would result in additional direct benefits cost in fiscal year 1974 (assuming an effective date of Jan. 1, 1974) of $123.2 million, of $250.5 million the first full fiscal year, and of $1.1 billion over the first 5 full fiscal years. A detailed breakdown of the number of trainees and estimated cost for each of the first 5 full fiscal years follows:

	Trainees	Direct benefits cost (millions)
Fiscal year:		
1975	801,000	$250.5
1976	767,000	239.7
1977	711,000	226.4
1978	657,000	201.8
1979	642,000	187.6
5-year total		1,100.0

In making this estimate, we have assumed that all veterans in private schools would receive the maximum benefit of $680 for full-time training, with proportional amounts, assumed for part-time training. Based on a study of veterans' tuition costs in public colleges, we have assumed that 45 percent will pay over $419 in fiscal year 1974 and that this will increase to 70 percent by fiscal year 1979. We have also assumed that this additional benefit would induce 2 percent of the veterans to switch from public institutions to private training facilities. The estimated additional costs are based on the number of veterans already expected to be in training. Thus, if additional veterans are induced to enter training due to the new benefit, the entire cost of their training would be additional.

For the foregoing reasons, the Veterans' Administration is opposed to the enactment of H.R. 11134.

We are advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report to your committee, and that enactment of H.R. 11134 would not be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. JOHNSON, *Administrator.*

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Our first witness is Mr. Odell W. Vaughn, Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans Administration who is accompanied by several of his associates.

If you are prepared to begin, Mr. Vaughn, we will hear your testimony. Good morning, it is nice to see you.

Mr. VAUGHN. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF ODELL W. VAUGHN, CHIEF BENEFITS DIRECTOR OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, ACCOMPANIED BY MORRIS (BOB) NOONER, DIRECTOR, EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION SERVICE, AND JOHN KERBY, ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL

Mr. VAUGHN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by introducing those persons at the table here with me from our office. John Kerby, General Counsel's office; Robert "Bob" Nooner, Director, Education and Rehabilitation Service; Andrew Thornton, his assistant.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, we are pleased to appear before you today to present the views of the Veterans' Administration on seven measures presently pending before your subcommittee which have, as their purpose, the payment of benefits to eligible veterans to partially defray the cost of their tuition.

These seven identical bills—H.R. 11154, H.R. 11545, H.R. 11681, H.R. 13183, H.R. 13184, H.R. 13185, and H.R. 13433—would amend section 1682 of title 38, United States Code, to add a new subsection (d) which would provide, in addition to the educational assistance already granted veterans, a tuition payment plan. Payments, which would be made directly to the eligible veteran, would be in an amount representing the cost of his tuition exceeding $419 for an ordinary school year. No such tuition payment could, however, exceed $600 for an ordinary school year. This benefit would be extended to veterans enrolled in programs of education on a halftime or more basis, but would not be extended to veterans pursuing programs of light training, nor to veterans pursuing programs on less than a half-time basis, or to servicemen on active duty pursuing programs of education under the GI bill.

As you are fully aware, a tuition payment plan was contained in the World War II GI bill program. Under the original enactment, the Administrator was permitted to pay to the schools, an amount not to exceed $500 per ordinary school year, to cover the customary cost of a veterans' tuition, fees, books, supplies, and equipment required by him to pursue and complete a course. Where an institution had no established tuition fee, the Administrator was permitted to provide fair and reasonable compensation up to $500 per ordinary school year.

Subsequent enactments, however, allowed an institution to apply for adjustments. As a result, four types of charges were eventually allowed: (1) Customary charges; (2) fair and reasonable compensation; (3) nonresident tuition rates; or (4) rates based on estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction.

As you are also fully aware, Mr. Chairman, a House select committee was appointed in 1950 to make a far-ranging study of the operation of the World War II program. This study, chaired by your former full committee chairman, Congressman Olin E. Teague, spotlighted many abuses of the tuition payment system, including veteran

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

enrollment aimed at financial gain rather than serious educational intent, with resulting exploitation of the veteran as well as the Government.

A further examination of the World War II GI bill program was made by the General Accounting Office. I urge that members of your staff interested in reconstituting a tuition payment plan read or reread the hearings of the House select committee and the reports of the select committee—House Report 1575, 82d Congress, second session—and the GAO—House Veterans' Affairs Committee Print No. 160, 82d Congress, first session. These reports and hearings delineate and describe the abuses which occurred during that earlier program.

I believe the following pertinent points brought out by the GAO survey are worth special mention, and I will quote some of these:

In the early stages of the veteran's vocational and educational program, the majority of the veterans participating were attending colleges. At the peak, 1,[illegible] veterans were enrolled in approximately 1,700 colleges. Although a limit of $500 was placed on the amount which could be paid in any one year for a veteran's tuition and fees, the schools were able to select one of the four alternative rates in billing the VA. . . .

There has been little difficulty, from an auditing standpoint, with payment of tuition charges at the "customary rate." This is the rate which had been in effect before the veterans' program started. However, due to rising costs, and because the great influx of veteran students seriously affected the budget of institutions depending on public appropriations or other nontuition sources, most of the schools abandoned this rate in favor of one of the other three which would provide a higher return to the school.

One college operating on the nonresident rate increased its charge from $25 to $100 a quarter for veteran students, notwithstanding the former rate had been computed on the basis of the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction. The increase was entirely out of line with costs and action has been taken to recover $340,000 overpaid to the school.

Another college, operating on a nonresident tuition rate of $15 a year (a substantial portion of the school's income was received from other agencies of the Federal Government, thus accounting for the low rate), increased its rate to $200 a school year; whereas its costs averaged $65 annually per student after deduction of Federal grants.

One eastern university receiving the nonresident rate decided to negotiate a contract providing for compensation based on the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction. However, this school was so successful in its dealings with the VA that it was able to collect both the negotiated credit-hour rates and, in addition, its customary "fixed charge" which was the only charge made other students on account of tuition. This resulted in payments of tuition in excess of the costs of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction allowable under the statute. For each veteran student the university received about $200 more per year than for a nonveteran resident of the State and $80 more than for a nonveteran student residing out of the State.

A number of State universities and colleges applied for and were paid tuition at nonresident rates for resident veterans despite the fact that, under constitution and statutes of the State, they were prohibited from charging tuition to State residents or a preferred rate of tuition was specified. * * *

One State military school received payments for instruction furnished to resident veterans both by way of State appropriations and under its VA contracts. The amount of the excess tuition was credited to the personal accounts of the students and balances remaining upon graduation were paid to them in cash. * * *

Many of the colleges were paid tuition based on the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction. In computing these costs, VA regulations required the schools to eliminate, as an item of cost, those salaries of teachers which were paid from Federal funds under grants such as Morrill-Nelson, Bankhead-Jones, and similar acts.

A number of the schools failed to comply with the Administrator's regulations and, consequently, audits by the General Accounting Office disclosed excessive payments totaling many hundreds of thousands of dollars. * * *

Examinations by the General Accounting office have disclosed that other overpayments of one type or another were made to a majority of the colleges examined. * * *

Mr. Chairman, I have cited only a very few paragraphs from the GAO report. This study, as well as the one conducted by the select committee, showed that in the earlier program all manner of irregular tuition payments occurred. Tuition was paid subsequent to the date of a veterans last attendance, tuition was paid where veterans had registered, but did not attend classes; tuition payments were obtained through collusion and fraud; tuition was paid for veterans attending school under scholarships; and tuition payments were based on erroneous or excessive costs.

As a result, the report of the House select committee contained the following recommendation, approved by the Congress when the Korean conflict GI bill was enacted:

The total payment, including an allowance for tuition, books, and supplies sufficient to maintain a veteran in training under average and reasonable conditions, should be paid directly to the veteran. From such an allowance the veteran should pay tuition, fees, and other charges not to exceed the charges paid by a nonveteran similarly circumstanced * * *.

That success-ful policy, without attendant abuses, has been carried forward into the current GI bill program that we seek today.

The educational assistance allowance, provided by law, has been increased substantially in recent years. In 1970, the allowance was increased by approximately 35 percent and, in 1972, the allowance was again increased, this time by approximately 25 percent over the rates set by the 1970 enactment. Thus, in approximately 4 years, the allowance has been boosted by nearly 70 percent over the benefit payable early in 1970. In addition, your committee has recently approved legislation which would, if enacted, increase benefit rates by another 13.6 percent.

In addition to these substantial rate increases, the laws which provided these benefit boosts also provided a large number of program liberalizations—programs not available to the World War II or Korean conflict veteran. These include such things as special assistance for educationally disadvantaged veterans without charge to their entitlement; a work-study program; tutorial assistance; the PREP program; and others. The proposed legislation would add a partial tuition payment to these substantial benefits already provided.

A comprehensive program of loans, grants, and other forms of financial aid is already provided through the National Defense Education Act and other related educational assistance programs administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These loan programs are operated on a low-interest basis and many contain provisions permitting forgiveness for portions of the loans for performance of certain types of public service, such as teaching in certain areas of the country. Other Federal agencies also sponsor programs of financial assistance for students in specific career fields and public and private groups are involved in aiding students who wish to further their education.

Because of these many sources of funds, we do not believe it is reasonable to set up still another program. Its administration would result in poor utilization of personnel and in a further spreading out

of sources of financial aid, requiring the veteran-student to apply to varied sources.

At the present time, under the law, the Veterans' Administration pays 90 percent of the cost of flight training and correspondence courses. In these two programs, where we are paying almost all of the tuition costs, the Veterans' Administration has encountered the most administrative difficulties. We have investigated and found instances where flight schools have falsely certified the amount of flight training veterans have received. This has, of course, resulted in considerable expensive litigation, not always successful, in attempting to prosecute flight school operators under criminal statutes and recover losses through civil actions. I am certain that the committee is fully aware of the many other problems we have had with correspondence training.

Our experience under the PREP program has shown that in those cases where a similar or same program has not previously existed, and the administrator is required to establish appropriate rates for tuition and fees designed to allow reimbursement for reasonable costs for the education or training institution, almost invariably the cost claimed is maximized to equal the full amount the Veterans' Administration is authorized to pay. Whenever the educational allowance is raised, schools' charges go up to the maximum payable.

Should the partial tuition payment system, as proposed in the pending measure, be adopted, we envision a substantial escalation in the tuition charges made by a large number of schools in the private sector, especially among those offering short-term, high-cost courses, where veteran enrollment predominates.

Since the present GI bill became effective June 1, 1966, it has provided education and training to 3.5 million Vietnam veterans, including 400,000 servicemen, together with an additional 1 million veterans who left service after 1955, and before the Vietnam era. We are pleased to state that after 93 months—June 1966 through February 1974—51.5 percent of the Vietnam era veterans and servicemen have trained under the current program. This is more than either the World War II or the Korean conflict participation rate during a comparable period of time.

We also provided training for 29,547 service-disabled veterans in fiscal year 1973, of which 23,983 were Vietnam era veterans. There is one interesting observation I would like to make concerning these chapter 31 trainees. Statistics show that 81 percent of the chapter 34 veterans pursuing college training attend public institutions whereas 19 percent attend private schools. In the chapter 31 area, which is an all-expense educational program and veterans have great latitude in choosing the school they wish to attend, 72 percent of the veterans pursuing college training attend public institutions and 28 percent attend private schools. Thus, even though these latter veterans have their tuition and other expenses paid for them, there isn't any substantial difference between the percentage of those veterans pursuing their training at public institutions under this program and those training at the college level under chapter 34 who are paid an educational assistance allowance.

We have just completed a comparison of the November 1973 college enrollment under the GI bill with resident tuition and fee charges made by the schools in which the trainees are enrolled. This compari-

son is based upon the educational allowance rate for a full-time college trainee with no dependents—those with dependents get more.

This comparison indicates that 46 percent of the GI bill college trainees pay less than $400 in tuition and fees and that 16 percent pay more than $1,000. The median rate of payment is $436. These data provide no information on the extent to which veterans pay higher tuition and fees because of nonresident charges or for graduate training, but these factors obviously would affect costs under these proposals for payment of tuition and fee charges which fall between $419 and $1,019.

The pending proposals would create numerous administrative problems for the Veterans' Administration which would have to be resolved. For example, these measures do not provide for any reimbursement to the Veterans' Administration if the veteran withdraws from school after receiving his tuition payment, but before the expiration of the school's refund period. This could mean that a veteran could, for example, enroll in school on September 1, the start of the school year, receive his $600 tuition payment, withdraw from school on September 15, and be entitled to a refund from the school of up to 80 percent of that payment. Since the veteran's entitlement is only chargeable against the subsistence payment, and not tuition, the veteran would be financially enriched without charge to this entitlement. And, there is no provision which would prevent this from occurring again and again.

Mr. Chairman, the Veterans' Administration is unalterably opposed to a return to a tuition repayment system, even though the payment would be made to the veteran instead of the school. We believe that this would again create the extreme administrative problems which faced the Veterans' Administration during the earlier program. In our judgment, a return would result in the same sort of abuses. We further believe that to add a tuition payment to the current educational assistance allowance already provided by law is totally unwarranted. The veteran today is the beneficiary of many programs not provided to the World War II or Korean conflict veteran. And, a tuition payment system, as contemplated in the pending legislation, would not be of any benefit to a large number of veterans currently training under the GI bill.

Apart from the foregoing, the Veterans' Administration is greatly concerned about the total change in philosophy which these bills reflect. Commencing with the Korean conflict program, is the long-standing congressional philosophy of providing partial educational benefits under programs designed to provide equal benefits for equal service. These bills would single out tuition as a sole factor for recognition, ignoring a host of other equally important cost factors. For example, there are the variables in transportation costs for students in residence, as distinguished from those who commute, as well as those who must incur variant travel expenses, depending on distances from home to school. Another cost factor not considered is the variable cost which relates to marital status and dependency. And, there are many other elements of educational cost. Enactment of any of these proposals would surely give rise to pressures for enactment of other costly measures to recognize these and other elements of educational

costs on a piecemeal basis. The establishment of such precedent would be most unfortunate.

We urge the Congress not to depart from the longstanding and time-proven philosophy of partial help and equal treatment for equal service. I would like to repeat that—partial help and equal treatment for equal service. As we view it, proposals such as this may only serve to unduly delay enactment of a reasonable across-the-board increase in educational assistance allowances which is needed now.

This concludes my statement. My associates and I will be pleased to respond to any questions you may have.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Wolff, do you have any questions?

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Vaughn, I read your statement and then I heard your statement, and I am deeply disturbed by it, I must say, because you single out the connivance of some unscrupulous school operators and a recognized incompetence, basically on the part of the Veterans' Administration to be able to search out those problems that existed with the old bill, you seek to penalize the veterans of Vietnam for problems that, at the present time, are nonexistent because they are not available to the veteran. What I am trying to say is that what you have done is banned the excesses that have existed in the past. How many cases were found? You quote the number of excesses under the old system of direct tuition payments. How many cases did you find, at that time? How many cases did the General Accounting Office find, at that time?

Mr. VAUGHN. I don't have the figures with me but I could submit them for the record.

[The following statement was placed in the record by the Veterans' Administration:]

Information is not available as to the exact number of cases of abuse found as a result of the direct payment of tuition to schools. Such information as is available may be found in the previously cited reports of the Select Committee (House Report 1375, 82d Congress, 2d Session) and the GAO (House Veterans' Affairs Committee Print No. 160, 82d Congress, 1st Session).

Mr. WOLFF. The amount of round figures, how many cases?

Mr. VAUGHN. I couldn't tell you, sir.

Mr. WOLFF. Were there thousands?

Mr. VAUGHN. Probably in the thousands when you consider all types of schools that were involved.

Mr. WOLFF. Thousands of excesses that you found?

Mr. VAUGHN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOLFF. There were at the time, according to your testimony, several million people involved in the program. You want to penalize the program that helped millions of veterans because of the thousands of excesses that occurred?

Mr. VAUGHN. You have left out, in my objection to the program, many other things that are stated in this statement that would tie in with that, not just the abuse portion of it. We are also considering, for example, the possibility of a person in one State, as opposed to another State.

Mr. WOLFF. That is just the problem that exists. There are differences in costs of education from one State to another.

Mr. VAUGHN. We are certain, as soon as any type of legislation is enacted, we will see schools in areas where they have been lenient

through State tax money and other sources to render assistance to veterans—we will see those people taking a look at us and wondering why they are not involved in this program. We would further like to emphasize, if we would go back to the GI bill and structure the cost dollar basis today, if we go back to that and start with the $75-per-month education allowance, add the tuition cost of it, we find that over 50 percent of the veterans attending school today would be penalized by your new program. The reason for that, sir, is if you will go back to the history of your current GI bill, you will note that in the training allowance itself is a built in cost that is assuming part of the tuition, books and supplies, and other fees. This is why the training allowance that you see today cannot represents the $75 that the veteran received. If you were to add tuition or go back to the World War II GI bill and bring your $75 allowance forward and add your tuition at the maximum of $600 to that, you would find 50 percent would be unpaid. On the other hand, if you take the present training allowance and add to that a cost-of-living increase, and then you add to that tuition, you are going far beyond anything ever offered during World War II and also changing the concept of the entire program of readjustment as has been brought out by Congress over the years.

Mr. WOLFF. Can you give us an idea of the cost of living in 1966, when the original bill was released, in dollars?

Mr. VAUGHN. Just one moment. Mr. Nooner will present that.

Mr. NOONER. The cost of living index in 1966, in January—the bill was in June—I will give you the June figure—was 97.1.

Mr. WOLFF. Yes, and the figure in 1974?

Mr. NOONER. In 1974, currently 141.5 is the current figure.

Mr. WOLFE. So in other words, there has been—and it is very difficult the way of indexing—to try to reflect full dollar amounts, because what you are reflecting here are percentage increases. Is that right?

Mr. VAUGHN. In reflecting our cost index figures, bringing it forward from the beginning of the bill, we use the figures that are established under the comparison, using the regular cost index. We have had no problem at all, sir. You do your takeoff back to the last enactment of legislation increasing the bill.

Mr. WOLFF. Can you give us an idea of the average cost of tuition in 1966, and that which exists in 1974?

Mr. VAUGHN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NOONER. In 1966, the average cost of tuition and required fees was $275 in public institutions.

Mr. WOLFF. How about private institutions?

Mr. NOONER. Was $1,233 sir.

Mr. WOLFF. In 1974?

Mr. NOONER. In 1974 it was $412 for public and nonpublic is $2,044. These are reflected as current figures for the academic year.

Mr. VAUGHN. Sir, I would like to add something to that. We have had, on several occasions, the question arise, a feeling on the part of some persons that the reason there has been a massive movement since the World War II program from private to public schools was because of the fact the tuition in private schools was such we were not permitting the veteran to go. We have evidence that the same treatment applies to nonveterans who are attending school.

Mr. WOLFF. It could be they couldn't afford it either?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. VAUGHN. It could be they couldn't. It is a Cadillac and Ford situation. You might also look at this along with that—we have had a massive increase in the number of junior colleges, for example, from the State of Florida, and I can tell you there our technical school program and junior college program has grown some 500 or 600 percent, increasing the number of schools available to attend in a hometown area, as opposed to a man having to travel some distance to go to school. We have had a massive increase in the number of State-supported institutions and they are good institutions, and I think we need to determine whether or not we are really saying the man is getting more for his money or whether he likes this private education, and which, in spite of the fact he is being paid properly to attend school, in spite of that fact, he has some preferences of his own, and are we going to recognize one veteran is being entitled to more than another? If the man wants to go to junior college in his hometown, are we going to say he is worth less to us than a man who wants to go to a private institution like Yale or Harvard?

Mr. WOLFF. Can you give us an idea of the poverty level in the United States during 1966 and today?

Mr. VAUGHN. No, sir, we don't have that.

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask your unanimous consent to include in the record a statement from the State University of New York supporting the program.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Without objection, it is so ordered. It will be made a part of the record.

[The document referred to follows:]

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1974.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLFF: As the House Subcommittee on Education and Training, Committee on Veterans Affairs, begins consideration of HR 13433, which you have sponsored, we want to take this opportunity to express our support for your efforts to provide greater educational opportunities for veterans.

Studies have shown that proportionally fewer veterans in New York and on the East Coast have participated in educational programs for a variety of reasons. The measures you have sponsored will result in a higher level of financial support to veterans and will assist them in meeting increasing costs of education. This program should make participation possible for larger numbers of veterans in all institutions of postsecondary education.

Both the veterans and their institutions will benefit from the programs you have proposed. You have our sincere gratitude for your efforts in behalf of our veterans.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. CLAIRE,
Director, Washington Office.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Zwach, do you have any questions?

Mr. ZWACH. No, I don't, at this time.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Walsh, do you have any questions?

Mr. WALSH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have some questions.

Mr. Vaughn, all through your presentation here, and when you quote the report of the committee that made the investigation and the abuses of the veterans GI bill, you indicate that you recommended that—the report recommends a tuition payment directly to the veterans, and throughout the balance of your report, you cite, as an argu-

ment, against the payment of those veteran benefits, the number of abuses that occurred during that period. Is there any comparable way that you could list any abuses that occur when the tuition may go directly to the veteran?

Mr. VAUGHN. Yes, sir. Under this system of tuition—for example, Congress said today that this training allowance, as it is currently providing the Vietnam veteran recognizes tuition and cost-of-living increases of that training allowance, recognizes increases in cost of living. Where the difference comes in, if you are tacking tuition onto this, even though you are paying it to the veteran, you run into the same abuses as if you paid it to the school. The reason for that is the veteran tuition, where it is tacked on, is identifiable as a separate entity, and as a result, you are still getting the tuition rates as the school lays them out as opposed to one training allowance and say this is your training allowance, you use it. If you want to go to an Ivy League school, then you know you have got to live within this or if you want to go to a free-tuition school, then you can live within this amount.

Mr. WALSH. Assuming this bill were passed, and the veteran was allowed up to $600 or $619 for tuition, wouldn't it be possible for the Veterans' Administration to adopt regulations, guidelines that would control some of these abuses you seem to fear?

Mr. VAUGHN. Yes, sir, but it would be quite a monster I can assure you of that. At this point, I have talked to a number of our people in our computer program system and also people in the education service—it would be quite difficult to police the schools and this is what we are really talking about—police action on the schools—and we must keep in mind we are not talking about the number of schools involved in World War II. As I have previously stated, there are many more schools than we had to deal with in World War II.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to me then you are admitting if this did pass, you could adopt the administrative regulations that would eliminate some of these abuses even though it would be difficult?

Mr. VAUGHN. I don't know that we could eliminate the abuses. Mr. Thornton is shaking his head here, and he is an expert in dealing with schools. We thought we had done that with the flight and correspondence schools, and I think it would be wise for the committee to look at those two. There has been quite a problem—State administration and State approval agencies—we are constantly going into those schools, and if we added to that listing the massive listing of learning institutions that would be involved here, I don't think we would eliminate the abuses, no.

Mr. WALSH. Would it be possible to adopt a regulation that would permit the veteran to enroll in school and then pay the tuition at a later time on a deferred basis?

Mr. VAUGHN. It would not be possible to adopt a regulation to that extent. I think that would dismiss the intent of Congress, to pay the tuition when the school demands it. Many schools demand tuition before the student ever enrolls. That is why we have the advance pay system now, to assist the veteran to get his tuition paid at the time of enrollment. We do not state the time when the tuition will be paid, the schools do that.

Mr. WALSH. Would it be possible to submit to the veteran a list of institutions that would submit their tuition and approved plans, tui-

tion bills and approved plan that the Veterans Administration would approve?

Mr. VAUGHN. I think you are just heading into another inequity, as the one we just mentioned a minute ago, and you would be treating one veteran differently from another by saying to him, defer tuition and only go to a school which permits you to defer tuition. You are heading back into the same problem, penalizing one veteran as opposed to another.

Mr. WALSH. I am trying to bring out the administrative problems that seem to plague the Veterans Administration more than the other problems connected with this.

To go on from there, you mentioned, I think, there were 1,700 colleges involved in the World War II and Korean conflict program. You were unable to tell us the number of abuses, but as I recall the figures, it was something like 1,100,000 veterans enrolled in those programs. You also indicated, in your statement, the colleges, during the period the veterans were enrolled, continued to raise their tuition. I am sure you were aware that the GI bill was in for a number of years. We had inflation in those years, too, and the costs did go up and I can remember when I enrolled in the GI bill, at Syracuse University, tuition was $13 an hour. We will have the chancellor down here next week to testify the tuition at Syracuse University now exceeds $3,000 a year. It was $13 an hour, at that time and is probably to $100 now. I submit the problem—part of the costs the schools have is inflation The same thing has happened recently, and you make another point here that the veteran wouldn't be able to handle this tuition payment, that we, in effect, can't trust him with the tuition payment, but yet we already give him $220 a month in benefits. I would think he would have the ability to handle the tuition payment if he can make himself live on the amount of money he gets under the GI bill.

Let me cite you the differences that veterans have in the way of living funds available to them in some of the various States.

In California, at the end of one month, they have $177.

New York State—Portland, which is a small part of the State university system in New York, they have $115.

In Massachusetts, they have $196 left.

Yet, in Indiana, they only have $122, and

In Ohio, $129 left.

There are vast differences in the living funds available to a veteran because of the different costs in the schools and living costs in the various areas.

I am sure it would cost much more money to attend a school in New York City then in upstate New York, and this is a quote from an upstate school, and I am sure it would be much lower than in New York City.

Mr. WOLFF. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. VAUGHN. Did you want me to respond to that, sir?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. I would like to yield to Mr. Wolff first.

Mr. WOLFF. I might say the veterans in New York make up the deficiency, in New York City, have to make up the deficiencies that exist, have to make them up in welfare payments. We are only adding to the welfare roles in New York City.

Mr. VAUGHN. I think I would respond to you—not taking individual situations. We are dealing here on a nationwide educational allowances

system. We would have to take the statistics I have been giving you here earlier to show you the majority of the veterans in this country are not only receiving an equal amount to the World War II program but in some instances they are receiving more than the World War II veteran received. I am not even speaking of the tutorial benefits or the free education for the man until he reaches the college level. I am not speaking of those added benefits. I am merely speaking of the majority of the veterans in this country today, under the GI bill, and this is based on actual figures, who are faring better under it.

Mr. WALSH. The study I would like to rely on is the one done by the Education Testing Service?

Mr. VAUGHN. They have two studies. One they compared Veterans Administration benefits. This is the one I am quoting from now. They had another one where they brought out some non-Veterans' Administration benefits like the man in certain schools was able to live in free or low-cost housing. They threw in other types of benefits available to some veterans during World War II that would distort the picture. There is no way you can measure all of these items and throw them in a "G.I. bill." If you would use the ETS study, based strictly on the Cost of Living Index, and also part of the study that had to do with what percentage of the veterans were receiving equal or greater benefits, you will find in the ETS study the same information I have been giving you.

Mr. HELSOSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

May I interject, at this point, you made the exact point last year. The ETS did come in and make an interpretation of your statement. They refuted your statement on their study last year.

Mr. VAUGHN. It is in the report.

Mr. HELSOSKI. You made an interpretation of their report last year, and they came in the succeeding day and disputed what you said.

Mr. VAUGHN. If so, they also disputed their own report because I have it right here in front of me, sir. The data is based on the bringing forward, to this time, the information that was in their report, the part of their report that had to do with the comparison of benefits by the Veterans' Administration. Now, World War II, as opposed to the Vietnam veteran, is not the part of their report that encompassed the information about veterans that had other types of things. They talked about real value.

Mr. WALSH. I am referring only to that part of the report that mentions the fact that, in most instances, the Vietnam era veteran is equal to the World War II veterans in the benefits he receives, with the exception of the fact he has to pay his own tuition—that the tuition averages $419 in public institutions, and this effectively means that veteran is barred from attending private institutions—he can't afford to make the payments for tuition. That is the part I am referring to. I thought the study thoroughly showed when it comes to a matter of tuition payments, free choice of institutions, the Vietnam veteran certainly does not have the choice the other veterans did.

In your statement, you talk about equal treatment for equal service, and I don't think we are giving them that and I think this study shows that.

I have one other question here on the matter of participation, Mr. Chairman. Over 6 years the veterans of New York State have been

able to use about 457 union dollars in GI bill payments, while in California, the veterans used $1,260,000. The participation rate in New York State; therefore, is 21 percent, and this is for colleges and junior colleges. The same participation rate in California is 37 percent. I don't think that the motivation and desire on the part of New York State veterans is any less than those in California, but yet they are not able to participate in the GI bill because of this cost of living they are faced with. Why should they be penalized from State to State?

Mr. VAUGHN. I think, sir, one of the biggest problems we are having here is the question of where one part of the geographical area of the country a man is attending school as opposed to another geographical area. I don't think the Congress has ever established any of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and I am well aware and familiar with it, having been with the programs, based on what geographical area you live in. I don't think we can ever get into this type of operation. This is what you are now comparing. You are not comparing one school as opposed to another. We all know why California has more veterans and more nonveterans percentagewise. California has a free tuition law. I don't think you can adjust by State and say to one State, you go ahead and give free tuition to the veterans in your State and we will give it to them in another.

Mr. WALSH. You are saying it is not providing them with an equal opportunity to participate in education because they may have to live in a different State. I am not asking for an equal offer in such State but I think if we would give them this tuition payment, it would enable them to participate to a greater extent because it would be a recognition of the problems they are faced with today.

Mr. VAUGHN. We had tuition during World War II and yet the Vietnam veteran participation rate for the 93 months is greater under the Vietnam era payment than the World War II. I think we have run into some problem with an organization of people who have had the opportunity to go to the media and say we are getting less, and therefore, we are not attending, not participating, and we are measuring this against facts, that is, statistics that are of record. We say, and we have all of the evidence in the world, that the participation rate of the Vietnam era veteran is greater than the World War II or the Korean conflict.

Mr. WALSH. I have no further questions.

Mr. HELSOSKI. Mr. Zwach, do you have any questions, at this time?

Mr. ZWACH. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Vaughn, what is the length of your experience in the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. VAUGHN. I came to work in March of 1946.

Mr. ZWACH. So you have experience, having worked in this area for some time?

Mr. VAUGHN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. Were you able to personally experience the World War II veterans program?

Mr. VAUGHN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. Interestingly enough, on page 8 of your testimony, you estimate that 51.5 percent of the Vietnam veterans are taking advantage of the educational program.

Mr. VAUGHN. That is correct.

Mr. ZWACH. I remember back 3 or 4 years ago, that figure was about 28 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. VAUGHN. About 4 years ago—that sounds right; yes, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. So the participation has grown. Was much of that increase a result of the increased payments that we made from $175 to $220?

Mr. VAUGHN. We have felt all along, each time we have a cost-of-living type increase, it brings the veteran back into the picture a little more, helps the participation.

Mr. ZWACH. Finally, on the legislation we have enacted in the House, which raises the basic educational payment to $250. Would you expect a further increase in the number attending?

Mr. VAUGHN. Yes, sir; we certainly would. Our experience we have just gone through, causing us to ask for a supplemental appropriation, has indicated, if you increase by a cost of living increase, you do experience a greater increase in participation.

Mr. ZWACH. I note, on the middle of page 8, you speak of the service-connected disabled veterans, and that all expenses are paid. Is that right?

Mr. VAUGHN. Yes, sir; all of their expenses are paid.

Mr. ZWACH. The experience there is about 75 percent of the disabled vets attend, even though all tuition is paid, public schools. About 28 percent attend private schools. Is that correct?

Mr. VAUGHN. That is correct, sir. It indicates there is this trend and also keep in mind, in World War II, we are talking about 1,700 institutions of higher learning which had a substantial number of veterans in training. We are now talking about 3,200. We are bringing the public institutions closer to the veteran with good education.

Mr. ZWACH. Apparently where some of the problems arise some States do not have available junior colleges as does California and my home State of Minnesota. In some States apparently, there aren't public institutions available and that is where this main push for this type of legislation is coming from. Is that a proper summary?

Mr. VAUGHN. That is correct. The theory I think we are encompassing here, starts when we start talking about one State as opposed to another.

Mr. ZWACH. Let' say, one region, as opposed to another, rather than State?

Mr. VAUGHN. That is right. Why single out tuition. We have many other cost factors. The New York News lists the major cities of the United States and shows there is a fluctuation city to city, State to State, not just in tuition but many other things. What have we done about the person who is still going to a school who has free tuition but his transportation costs him $50 or $60 a month to attend school? Are we going to look at this?

Mr. ZWACH. Is it the opinion of the Veterans' Administration that it would be difficult to correct the abuse that we have under the other programs?

Mr. VAUGHN. I think it would be impossible, sir, to police 3,200 institutions of higher learning, plus all of our other schools we have that are not institutions of higher learning.

Mr. ZWACH. You don't assume, of course, everybody would switch from public to private schools?

Mr. VAUGHN. Not at all. If this were true——

Mr. ZWACH. Even with those that would, say a fourth of them, a third of them, you still would have a tremendous job of policing with tightest possible rules?

Mr. VAUGHN. You also would have the inequity to the State in which the tuition is paid for the man as opposed to that State where he is paying his own tuition, so the taxpayers in this State, giving free tuition to the veteran, for example, are being penalized due to their free tuition. They do not get part of this same money. I predict, after we finished with this amendment, we would have the next amendment coming up, trying to adjust to this situation.

Mr. ZWACH. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Yes.

Mr. WOLFF. One further question. The point that you make on page 11—"we urge the Congress not to depart from the long-standing and time-proven philosophy of partial help and equal treatment for equal service"—first of all, I don't believe we are getting equal treatment because there are variations that exist in various places in the country. For those who single out those high cost areas, let me remind them those high cost areas are the ones that provide the income for the Federal Government and a greater proportion of the income for the Federal Government to be able to pay all of these low-income areas that provide very little to the Federal income. I think it is unfair for us to consider the fact that there is a differential that exists in the costs of a person's own personal status when we come down to the question of the contribution that is paid by these areas.

We had a situation just recently on the floor whereby there was a zeroing in—I see that coming here, in another educational area—zeroing in on New York State because we have higher costs of education.

Let me remind all of the critics that we provide a greater income to the Federal Government from New York State than any of the other States, and many of the smaller States combined. I think that should be a part of the determination as to how we shall cross out.

Now, I do notice, that in the figures that you gave me before, there has been a 40 percent increase in tuition payments from the years 1966 to 1971, over a 40 percent increase; a 60 percent increase in the cost of private tuition payments. That is excluding a rise of 44.4 points in the cost of living. Hardly, can you say, when you take percentages, it is very easy for us to take percentages and if you have an increase of 100 percent over 1 percent, you have got a 101 percent increase. If you have got 100 percent increase over 25 percent, you have got 125 percent. The point I am making, when you talked about showing a 70 percent increase over the Korean and World War II programs, it was the fact we were just catching up with the fact that the increase had far exceeded, on a dollar basis, had far exceeded the needs of the veterans in those years.

What I am trying to say, I am trying to get across to you, if I can, the fact that I think, in addition, to a calculated percentage, the Veterans Administration and OMB needs a little bit of heart, and I think it is about time we did consider the fact there are injustices to guys that went out and gave their lives to this country, and if they can't afford to participate in the program, I think we should make adjust-

needs to permit them to, and the mere fact 50 percent of the veterans of Vietnam are not participating, shows very graphically we are not meeting the needs of the Vietnam Veteran. Thank you.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, could I have another comment, please.

Mr. HEFTEL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. On page 9 of your statement, Mr. Vaughn, you indicate that 46 percent of the GI bill college trainees pay less than $400 in tuition and fees and that 16 percent pay more than $1,000. This indicates that 54 percent pay over $400, and really there is 38 percent in between the $400 and the $1,000 tuition. This means that a pretty good chunk of that is coming out of their cost of living, and it seems to me that this is an inequity that we have to face.

There is another thing that seems to run through your statement. I really can't pin it down, but I get the feeling the Veterans' Administration is taking the position that this is as much a State responsibility as it is a U.S. Government responsibility, and I want to make it very clear, anything I say here today, that I don't go along with that type of philosophy. These veterans gave a service for their country, not for individual States, and some States are doing more and some less.

The other thing I want to correct, is the impression I may have left that New York State is not doing anything for its veterans. New York State is providing probably one of the finest higher education systems in the country—community colleges all the way through, 4-year institutions and graduate schools, so I do want to correct that impression too, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HEFTEL. Mr. Vaughn, I have the testimony I made reference to—Tuesday, October 2, 1973, the statement of James L. Bowman, the director of the Financial Aid Studies and Programs, Educational Testing Service, page 1885, he made reference to a study, and said this:

> As our study found, the current level of benefits, when adjusted for the average cost of tuition, fees, books, and supplies at a 4-year public institution, represents a significantly smaller proportion of U.S. average monthly earnings than did the subsistence allowance paid to the veteran of World War II.
>
> This is true whether the veteran is attending a 4-year or 2-year public college, whether he is single or has dependents.
>
> Only when the Vietnam veteran's expenditures for tuition, fees, books, and supplies are equal to or less than the average 4-year public institutions are his allowances slightly higher than the subsistence allowance paid his World War II counterpart, adjusted for changes in the Consumer Price Index.
>
> However, unlike the veteran of World War II, the Vietnam conflict veteran finds a wide variance in the portion of his educational allowance available for subsistence payments, depending on the tuition and fees of the institution he attends.

Now, here is the point:

> In its previous testimony, the Veterans' Administration quoted a sentence from the report: It is apparent that the average Vietnam veteran attending a 4-year public or a 2-year public institution has educational benefits slightly higher than his World War II counterpart when adjustments for changes in the Consumer Price Index are made, and subsequently made the observation that 80 percent of current veterans are better off than their World War II counterparts.

This is what E.T.S. said in regard to your statement evaluating their report.

> The sentence is taken out of context and can be misleading, for our report subsequently states:
>
> To the extent that a Vietnam veteran is not average, in other words, attending an institution where the tuition exceeds the U.S. average of $419 for a public

institution, then his benefits are less than those available to the veteran of World War II.

That was the point of his testimony when he came before this committee to refute the position of the Veterans' Administration. Now, the Veterans' Administration may have a different position than E.T.S.

Certainly, your interpretation of that study of the Congress——

Mr. VAUGHN. The E.T.S. contract was about $92,000.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Rather comprehensive in nature to the relative comparisons between World War II and the Vietnam veterans. You made much in your testimony of the abuses in World War II. No doubt there were abuses but with the implementation of our program—naturally abuses are inherent in new programs—I am more interested in not the differences in philosophy that the Veterans' Administration might have in terms of this particular bill, but some projected costs that would be involved in the passage of such legislation. Could you provide for us any suggested figures as to what the cost of such a program would be?

Mr. VAUGHN. Yes, sir. Would you like us to provide this for the record?

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Please. You don't have it available now, but you can provide it for the record?

Mr. VAUGHN. It has been costed, by the General Counsel. It has a cost estimate attached which, I believe, gave you those figures, sir. The report states, for fiscal year 1975, the cost, as stated in millions, would be $259.5. For 1976, $259.7 million, and in 1977, $220.4 million; for 1978, $201.8 and the last, 1979, $187.6.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Sir, the completion of the program——

Mr. VAUGHN. That is a direct benefit cost. That does not include the administration of the program.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. In addition to the statistics, can you provide us with a further breakdown as to where these costs occur and what kinds of institutions, and their location?

Mr. VAUGHN. We can provide that for the record. I don't think we have that detailed a report.

[The following data was provided for the record:]

PARTIAL REIMBURSEMENT FOR COST OF TUITION

In estimating the cost of the tuition provision, we have made the following assumption:

Based on a study of public colleges in which we utilized VA enrollment data and Office of Education tuition data, we have concluded that 45% of the full-time veterans will pay over $419 for tuition in FY 1974. We have assumed 50% for 1975 and 70% by 1979.

Again based on the study, we have computed an average tuition of $580 for those veterans with tuition charges in excess of $419. Thus, the VA payment would be $170. The $170 was inflated to $180 for 1975 (6%), with a similar inflation factor for each succeeding year to 1979. Proportional amounts are assumed for part-time trainees.

Based on VA records about 81% of all college veterans attend public institutions and 19% attend private. Approximately 912,000 public and 214,000 private college trainees are expected in FY 1975. Another 114,000 veterans are projected for private trade schools. Because private college tuitions average $2,065 nationwide, we have assumed that all full-time trainees in private institutions, whether in colleges or in trade schools, would receive the maximum benefit of $600 a year, with proportional amounts for part-time.

An estimated 2% of all trainees would switch from public to private training facilities because of this additional benefit.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. You also made a statement concerning advanced payments. How is that program working? The intent of it was to provide monies for the veteran so he wouldn't be at a disadvantage in terms of his enrollment at the institution. Are those payments current? If a veteran is enrolling in September for that particular semester——

Mr. VAUGHN. We had a number of problems in the initial application of the advance pay system. Since that time we have analyzed those problems consistently going into each detail, why any group of veterans failed to receive their advance payment. It did work. It worked well. We had over 700,000 veterans who received advance pay. In the following month, the month of September, we had 110,000 more who received advance pay. We still had too many institutes, and we have admitted it all along, where it did fail.

We had things we never would have thought about occurring happening. The post office returning checks to the Veterans Administration because they were addressed in bulk to a single address, a school. We changed that when we discovered it. The post office has always been told, the people that work there, to watch out for a number of checks going to a single address. We resolved that by putting the name of the school first and then the veteran. Plus, veterans applying too late to the beginning enrollment date, not requesting advance payment, or giving necessary information.

The biggest failure is the lack of communication, and this is one of the things we are working on.

I just came from a meeting with a group of Veterans' Affairs Counselors in New York last night to discuss all of these same problems with them and point out what we intend to do to get a good clean advance pay system going.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. What would you say the current status of the program is in terms of giving the payments to the veterans on time. Is that fairly well cleared up at this point?

Mr. VAUGHN. Yes, sir. I want to caution you on one thing. This is something we will always run into throughout the history of the Veterans' Administration. You can always pull out cases that were not paid on time. There is no way to completely correct the program. We have made great strides.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. You made some allusion to 1,000 cases, which indicated abuse of the system in the World War II program. As we went through Korea and Vietnam, in terms of payments, how did that percentage of abuses, no matter what they were, how does that compare, percentagewise?

Mr. VAUGHN. With the exception of the flight schools and correspondence schools, we are not paying direct tuition so therefore we are not incompassing the same problems we had. With the flight school and correspondence school we have had severe problems, and I am sure this committee has been made aware of it.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. So actually, there has been tremendously diminishing abuses through these three programs, and second, the greatest level of abuse comes in two areas, flight school and correspondence school?

Mr. VAUGHN. At the present time, because of the tuition, yes, sir.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Would a voucher system be the best approach to protect against abuses and at the same time have the money go directly to the veteran? Would this advance payment a veteran could

receive, for example, $300 a semester, a voucher which the school could present to the Veterans' Administration and thereby assure that the money went to tuition and was given to the veteran for that payment? I am suggesting some guideline or some procedural method for its payment to minimize any possibility of abuse.

Mr. VAUGHN. Of course, I have not gone into this with our staff very deeply because, at this point, we do not see a method of avoiding this type of thing regardless of whether you pay it to the veterans in the school, have a receipt to show he has paid his tuition—we do not know of any way we could administer it with regard to the laws we have now.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. But the Veterans' Administration would be able to manage the program, wouldn't it?

Mr. VAUGHN. We would be able to manage the program but I could not say that we would be able to prevent abuses because we are, at the present time, talking about a jump from 1,700 institutions to 3,200. We are talking about some 8,000 branches, branch schools, operating on their own or under those 3,200.

Mr. WOLFF. Will the gentleman yield?

It seems to me that here again we would penalize the veterans because of the fact the Veterans' Administration can't handle the problem. It may be that this whole program doesn't belong in the Veterans' Administration. We do have programs of education handled very well in HEW. Maybe that is the way to do it? I don't know, but it seems to me we shouldn't penalize the veteran because the Veterans' Administration isn't able to handle the program.

Mr. VAUGHN. As I mentioned earlier, that is only one facet to this total problem of the tuition.

Mr. WOLFF. But you indicate you would not be able to check out the schools that are involved, increased numbers of schools involved. How are you doing that now with all of the people that are getting the payments of the $220? How are you able to in any way check out and see to it that the veteran is going to a school that is a credited school and what have you?

Mr. VAUGHN. The veteran today has a great deal to do with the policing of the school.

Mr. WOLFF. That is the point we are making.

Mr. VAUGHN. He is assisting in this policing action because he is not going to that school if he recognizes the fact he can get first class education in the New York schools or the California Universities or junior colleges. If he recognizes he can get that first class service for a lesser amount—part of the policing is right there in the question of the cost.

Mr. WOLFF. Do you mean the Veterans' Administration doesn't have sufficient faith in the veterans themselves to do exactly such as you have indicated here, if there is an increased amount that is available, the point that was being made by Mr. Walsh before?

Mr. VAUGHN. I am not sure the veteran would have that much control over it. This goes back to World War II, and this is why I would urge you to go back and read or reread the General Accounting Office report. You will find, as soon as you pay a tuition rate of $400 to $600, you will find that the tuition of the schools will be adjusted accordingly.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. This is a point also. This is only a partial supplementation of the actual tuition payment, but could you give us any figures in terms of the numbers of colleges that would be involved in such a program? Let's just put aside, for awhile the flight schools and correspondence schools. Let's just talk about 4-year institutions and 2-year institutions, that have as an average cost of tuition over $400?

Mr. VAUGHN. That would go over?

Mr. HELSTOSKI. The national average of $400?

Mr. VAUGHN. I think we would have to submit that for the record.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Could you give me a rough estimate, at this time? I want to make a point in conjunction with that number—a number that you would use yourself?

Mr. VAUGHN. I don't think I could, not at the $400 break. Most of the studies made by the Veterans' Administration were made independently of a certain level of $400 as opposed to $600, for example, so I would not have that breakout for you now, but I could get it.

[The following data was submitted for the record:]

PARTIAL REIMBURSEMENT FOR COST OF TUITION

In estimating the cost of the tuition provision, we have made the following assumption:

Based on a study of public colleges in which we utilized VA enrollment data and Office of Education tuition data, we have concluded that 45% of the full-time veterans will pay over $419 for tuition in FY 1974. We have assumed 50% for 1975 and 70% by 1979.

Again based on the study, we have computed an average tuition of $589 for those veterans with tuition charges in excess of $419. Thus, the VA payment would be $170. The $170 was inflated to $180 for 1975 (6%), with a similar inflation factor for each succeeding year to 1979. Proportional amounts are assumed for part-time trainees.

Based on VA records about 81% of all colleges veterans attend public institutions and 19% attend private. Approximately 912,000 public and 214,000 private college trainees are expected in FY 1975. Another 114,000 veterans are projected for private trade schools. Because private college tuitions average $2,095 nationwide, we have assumed that all full-time trainees in private institutions, whether in colleges or in trade schools, would receive the maximum benefit of $600 a year, with proportional amounts for part-time.

An estimated 2% of all trainees would switch from public to private training facilities because of this additional benefit.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. We are not going to add any great number of institutions because of the higher cost of tuition levels, somebody is already going there—we may take on some new institutions but in terms of the total program, it would be, in effect, adding some kind of certification, a veteran is already attending. I don't see any great problem in terms of the administration.

Mr. WALSH. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Along this same line, it occurs to me someplace in the testimony, it shows there are about 3,200 institutions, now, you would have to be concerned with if this tuition plan went into effect.

Mr. VAUGHN. Plus about 8,000 breakoff schools from that 3,200, sir. I am speaking of institutions of higher learning. This does not include your flight courses, correspondence, or technical.

Mr. WALSH. You referred to 1,700 you had to be concerned about payment of the World War II benefits and Korean benefits. Now, you mention a figure of 3,200 institutions, which would almost, in effect, double your problems. At least, that is what I got from your testi-

mony. Even though you are doubling your schools—not quite doubling the number—how many veterans are we talking about in terms of numbers? How many veterans benefited under the other GI bills? What would be the total number?

Mr. VAUGHN. We are speaking now, at the present time of 1 million to 600,000 veterans in round figures, sir, attending some type of school, and there are some 13,000 different establishments.

[The following additional data was furnished for the record by Veterans' Administration:]

A second reference is made to 2,200 institutions (presumably) training persons under the current GI bill. The *Education Directory* 1973–74 (published by the U.S. Office of Education) shows 2,738 recognized U.S. institutions of higher education. VA data shows that in November 1973 there were 2,760 colleges (school units) approved by State approving agencies which were training 908,281 veterans and servicemen. This latter figure includes some trainees not training in college level courses. There were 879,352 college level trainees. However, counts from other sources identify a larger number of participating college level school units including separate count of some branches or divisions. In a study prepared for the Office of Education under a contract with the Brookings Institution and the National Academy of Public Administration Foundation, there are 3,245 degree granting institutions of which 3,093 are approved for veterans (p. 411). An earlier table in this same publication (p. 309) shows 3,243 degree granting institutions of higher education reported by "veterans approving agencies." In all there were 2,200,000 veterans trained in college under the World War II GI bill and 1,213,000 trained in college under the Korean conflict GI bill. As of November 1973, 2,300,000 veterans and servicemen had trained in college under the current GI bill of whom 1,786,000 had served during the Vietnam era. This adds up to 5,713,000 veterans and servicemen who had trained under the three GI bills through November 1973. Through March 1974 the total is 5,842,000.

Mr. WALSH. The figure you quoted of the number of veterans attending school, is that just for the Vietnam era veterans presently in school?

Mr. VAUGHN. This figure would include the veterans and their dependents attending school under chapter 31, but the greatest portion of that figure would be chapter 34 type veterans, regular GI bill.

Mr. WALSH. What I am looking for is a comparison between the number of veterans using the program now and the number of veterans that used the previous programs, the total number. What I am looking for is a relationship between the administrative problems you would have with 1,200,000 veterans with the total number that used the previous GI bill.

Mr. VAUGHN. I have a breakout from—the total trained at that time was 7,787,890, under the Vietnam era; now, 1966 to 1974, 3,559,427.

Mr. WALSH. I submit, if you are talking about administrative problems, you are cutting your administrative problems down from the previous GI benefit period almost in half, even though the number of schools are increasing?

Mr. VAUGHN. Yes, sir. The tuition problem would not be in the number of students, but it is regulated not by the number of students but by the institution itself regardless of whether they have 1 or 100 veterans. It is not the number of veterans in school, it is the number of institutions who are setting the rate of the tuition.

Mr. WALSH. No further questions.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Are there any other questions?

Mr. WOLFF. I have one further question.

The Veterans' Administration, I think has as much interest in the veterans, as I certainly do, but when it gets down to a question—as I

understand you said it was $250 million the cost of this program as projected for the first year—is that correct?

Mr. VAUGHN. Yes, sir—benefits only, not the administration of the program.

Mr. WOLFF. Who, in this Nation, is more important, the Vietnam veteran or Vietnam today. We are giving $600 million to Vietnam to hold down their inflation. I think if we are going to talk, I think we have got to start thinking about those people that have participated and contributed ot this Nation.

Mr. VAUGHN. It was the same Congress that passed those bills.

Mr. WOLFF. That is one of the reasons why we are up here today. This Kid on Hamburger Hill—and you are not going to put a price tag on his contribution. The lives we lost there have no price tags. I think it is time we recognized that instead of the rhetoric we are doing everything we can for the Vietnam veteran. I don't think we should concentrate on a few guys that were POW's. How about the other men that served in Vietnam? If we can afford giving $600 million to stop the inflation in Vietnam, we can afford to give $250 million to the veterans that have served in Vietnam.

Thank you.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Are there further questions? If not, we thank you very much, Mr. Vaughn. You and your staff, the people you have brought in here, we certainly appreciate your statements, and you will provide those figures you promised?

Mr. VAUGHN. Yes, we will.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you very much.

We have, as our next witness, the statement of Charles Mattingly, Deputy Director of the National Legisative Commission of the American Legion, and Edward H. Golembieski, also of that organization.

Gentlemen, if you would come forward we will proceed. It is good to see you here this morning, and we welcome you to the committee.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to thank you and the subcommittee for the opportunity to again appear before you, and comment on several proposals that are now pending in the subcommittee.

First of all, I would like to introduce a new assistant director, who will be working with us down through the years, Mr. Edward J. Lord.

Mr. Chairman, I realize time is closing in on you. For that reason, Mr. Golembieski, who appeared at the previous hearing last July, is with me again this morning, and Mr. Golembieski's background is well known to you. He is highly qualified to comment on this legislation and at this point I would like to introduce him. Ed is prepared, Mr. Chairman, to read a couple of pages of his statement and then comment on the remainder, if he may.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES E. MATTINGLY, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION AND EDWARD H. GOLEMBIESKI, DIRECTOR NATIONAL VETERANS AFFAIRS AND REHABILITATION COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. GOLEMBIESKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As Mr. Mattingly pointed out, we did appear before this committee on July 25, 1973, to testify in support of our position that a direct payment to cover

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

tuition fees and books up to $1,000 should be payable in addition to the monthly rates of subsistance. Our statement, I believe, taken from a variety of sources, does document the need that there should be a supplemental payment, and at this point, I would like to read from page 8 of the statement.

In making a comparison of educational benefits, it is not sufficient to determine what payments today would be equivalent to those available to veterans of earlier wars. The real measure or value of educational benefits is the goods and services they will purchase. In this instance, what type of education is available to Vietnam veterans on the basis of current benefits, in comparison to similar benefits provided to their World War II counterparts?

Recently, the Veterans Administration published information on Vietnam Era veteran GI Bill enrollment in junior and four-year colleges by States based on participation rates. Ranked on the basis of cumulative participation rates of Vietnam veterans, it is found that those states with the most highly developed low-cost public educational systems have the greatest degree of veteran participation. These participation rates ranged from 37 percent in California to 14.2 percent in Vermont.

From this, it is apparent that a strong relationship exists bteween state per capita expenditures on higher education and veteran participation rates. This information supports the presumption that veterans living in states that do not provide low-cost, easily accessible opportunities for higher education, benefit less from Veterans Administration educational assistance because they cannot meet the cost of education in their states.

The fact is that higher education is not uniformly accessible to today's returning veterans as it was to the veterans of World War II. Tuition rates in 1948 were generally less than the direct maximum payment of $500 to institutions for tuition, books, fees, and supplies. Consequently, the World War II veteran had access to almost any institution of higher learning in the United States. Generally, equal military service did provide equal readjustment opportunities.

To restore equity among veterans residing in different states with differing systems of public education, some form of variable payment to diminish the difference in state institutional cost is indicated.

In the judgment of the American Legion, a uniform percentage increase in the existing educational assistance rates is not the best answer to the problem. At most, it would further increase the advantage of those veterans residing in states with a highly developed state-supported system of higher education.

Mr. Chairman, the American Legion believes that the answer to the clear and definite problem that exists in providing the most effective educational assistance to the greatest number of Vietnam veterans, rests in a separate payment, available to the veteran, and payable to the institution of his choice, of an amount that is reasonable and feasible, to cover the cost of tuition, fees, books and other usual student charges.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes, I believe, the summary of the purpose of our statement, and I am available for any questions you may ask of me.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Your statement will be included as part of the record. It is concise, and we thank you very much.

[The document referred to follows:]

STATEMENT OF CHARLES E. MATTINGLY, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION; AND EDWARD H. GOLEMBIESKI, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL VETERANS AFFAIRS AND REHABILITATION COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

Thank you on behalf of The American Legion for this opportunity to again appear before your distinguished Subcommittee to present our organizations views on the several pending proposals to authorize additional payments to veterans pursuing their educations under Chapter 34 of title 38, to partially defray the cost of tuition.

Mr. Chairman, The American Legion is very proud of the fact that of our membership of some 2,700,000 war veterans, some 500,000 are veterans of the Vietnam War. In other words, these one-half million veterans of the Vietnam

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

war represent the second largest segment of our membership, the largest of course being veterans of World War II. Under the circumstances, I believe you will agree with me, in that our mandate to seek improvements in their educational program is of the highest priority to the Legion.

With the exception of three areas, benefits available to Vietnam veterans are equal or comparable to benefits available to veterans of other wars. Earlier this week we testified before the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension at which time we asked that eligibility for the VA grant toward the purchase of automobiles for certain disabled Vietnam veterans be made the same as for veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict. Also H.R. 12628, a product of this Subcommittee, which passed the House without a dissenting vote on February 19 would equalize the eligibility requirements for vocational rehabilitation for these veterans. The third and most glaring inequity of course pertains to the payment of tuition, or some other means that would permit Vietnam veterans to reasonably afford the cost of tuition in the school of his or her choice.

At the earlier hearings by the Subcommittee last July the Director of our National Veterans Affairs and Rehabilitation Commission, Mr. E. H. Golembieski, was our expert witness. Mr. Golembieski, in addition to his national staff, works in tandem with some 950 representatives accredited to The American Legion. These representatives are located in VA regional offices, hospitals and other VA facilities throughout the Nation. He therefore has a wealth of knowledge at his fingertips concerning the day by day problems Vietnam and other veterans experience. He has also conducted several in-depth studies of the Vietnam veterans' education program.

Mr. Golembieski is with me again today and will be our expert witness. He is prepared to read our statement or summarize, whichever you prefer.

STATEMENT OF E. H. GOLEMBIESKI, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL VETERANS AFFAIRS AND REHABILITATION COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

As you know, we appeared before this Subcommittee on July 25, 1973, to present the views of The American Legion on needed improvements in the educational assistance program for Vietnam veterans.

Considering the continuing increase in education and training costs, it is particularly timely that this Subcommittee again direct its attention to the education and training needs of our young veterans. Cost of going to colleges or universities, particularly the private institutions, are increasing as such a rate that additional assistance must be provided to ease the cost burden for veterans. Because of their service in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam War, they are deserving of the nation's assistance in coping with rising education and training costs.

War veterans, Mr. Chairman, regardless of the time in our history, are a major source of national strength and pride. They are living proof of our heritage—always willing to come to the assistance of the nation in times of need. The Vietnam War veterans are now in need of the nation's assistance to prepare themselves to take their rightful place as contributing members of our society.

The several measures under discussion today would amend Chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, so as to authorize additional payments to veterans to partially defray the cost of tuition. In this connection, we should like to present the views of The American Legion.

Education assistance programs for Vietnam War veterans of our Armed Forces were developed by the Congress to (1) extend the benefits of higher education to eligible persons who might not otherwise be able to afford such education or training; (2) provide vocational readjustment and restore educational opportunities to those veterans whose careers have been interrupted by reason of active duty in the Armed Forces; and (3) aid such persons in attaining the vocational and educational status which they might normally have aspired to and attained had they not served our nation.

Since the approval of the initial provisions of the educational assistance program for the Vietnam Era veteran on March 3, 1966, monthly educational assistance payments have been increased, on the average, by about one hundred twenty percent.

Despite the last increases in educational assistance payments authorized by PL 92-540, approved October 24, 1972, education expenses alone, in many in-

stances, often exceed the monthly educational assistance payment from the Veterans Administration.

Increased costs of tuition, books, fees, and other charges, as well as food, clothing, housing, medical and dental care, and other necessities of living, cause many veterans to make a second sacrifice for our nation by either not using their eligibility for educational assistance, or by pursuing a program of education or training at considerable financial cost to themselves or to their families or dependents—a circumstance for many veterans in marked contrast to the Congressional purpose of the Veterans Educational Assistance program established for them in Chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code.

The release of October 1, 1972 of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities advised—

"Undergraduate students returning to many of the nation's state colleges and universities this fall will encounter increase in the cost of their tuition, room and board.

"According to a survey conducted by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the median cost of tuition, room and board increased three percent for resident students and 8.5 percent for non-resident students."

Median student charges at state colleges and universities were reported as follows in the foregoing release—

Year	Total charges [1]	
	Resident	Nonresident
1972–73	$1,304	$2,087
1971–72	$1,227	$1,757
Percent increase	3.0	8.5

[1] Total charges is a median of tuition and fees, room and board, including only those institutions that provide housing.

A report of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Office of Research and Information, sheds further light on the 1972–73 student charges—

MEDIAN STUDENT CHARGES AT STATE AND LAND GRANT INSTITUTIONS

Year	Total charges [1]	
	Resident	Nonresident
1972–73	$1,457	$2,328.00
1971–72	$1,406	$2,208.50
Percent increase	4.33	5.41

[1] Figures shown are the median rates for typical full-time undergraduate students for 2 semesters, 2 trimesters or 3 quarters.

In this report, the Office of Research and Information said—

"A look at what happened to tuition charges since 1964–65 (the first year for which ORI has comparative data) shows that resident students now pay 75 percent more than they did eight years ago and non-residents pay 115 percent more. This amounts to an average annual increase of 9.4 percent for residents and 14.4 for non-residents.

"Comparative data on total costs over the eight years shows that prices have gone up 49.7 percent for resident students and 79.5 percent for non-residents. The average annual increase over the period amounts to 6.2 percent for residents and 9.9 percent for non-residents.

"The following chart shows medians for tuition and total charges, resident and non-resident, for the years 1964–65 and 1972–73 and the percentage of increase in each category.

	Tuition		Total charges	
	Resident	Nonresident	Resident	Nonresident
1964–65	$295.00	$612.00	$980	$1,297
1972–73	$517.50	$1,319.50	$1,467	$2,328
Percentage increase	75.4	115.6	49.7	79.5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In this same interval, the Consumer Price Index (1967=100) advanced from 94.5 to 138.5, an increase of 46.6 percent. Since the cost of tuition and total charges has advanced at a higher rate than goods and services, there is no validity to the Administration's statements that the amounts of educational assistance have been responsive to advancing costs of education as measured by the Index.

None of the foregoing cost comparisons of students in undergraduate colleges and universities—past, current, and projected—include the cost of books, transportation, and incidentals.

Of particular interest to us and we hope to the Subcommittee, is the Canisius College Report. The Canisius College Veterans Club, on February 1, 1973, decided unanimously to endorse publicly pending legislation that they believed would benefit the Vietnam veteran. But prior to any blanket endorsement, they decided to make a complete study of current GI education benefits as compared to those benefits received by World War II student veterans in public and private institutions.

The principal purpose of the study was to compare all educational benefits received by both groups of veterans and to determine if parity exists for the Vietnam veteran. Several factors were taken into consideration, namely; increased cost of education over the past 26 years (in constant dollars), inflation of the dollar, changes in subsistence allowance from 1945 to 1972, GI Bill tuition allowance for 1945 to 1972, and, finally the increase in room and board from school year 1945–46 to school year 1971–72.

In an attempt to discover any discrimination among types of institutions, six student categories were considered. The following has been excerpted from the appendices of their report. Monthly subsistence requirements are for a full-time undergraduate for the 1971–72 school year—

Public Institution In-state Resident—Monthly subsistence should be—$198.68.

Private Institution In-state Resident—Monthly subsistence should be—$380.84.

Public Institution Out-of-State Resident—Monthly subsistence should be—$295.24.

Private Institution Out-of-State Resident—Monthly subsistence should be—$380.84.

Public Institution In-state Commuter—Monthly subsistence should be—$197.40.

Private Institution In-state Commuter—Monthly subsistence should be—$363.66.

Their study found that not only does parity not exist for today's veteran, Vietnam War veterans are also being denied the freedom of choice as to which institution of higher education they wish to attend. The tuition allowance permitted this degree of choice for the veteran of World War II under the original GI Bill. A direct tuition allowance would give the Vietnam veteran a greater degree of flexibility in planning his education.

Their report concludes with this paragraph:

"The Canisius College Veterans' Club recommends the following: there is a need for a plan with the built-in flexibility to account for the varying costs of higher education. A sliding scale tuition benefit plan seems to meet all these differing needs; a plan that would pay up to $1,680 or the cost of tuition, whichever is less. This step would do far more to provide both equity and parity to today's veteran than any change in subsistence allowance. Thus, to bring back the tuition allotment of 1945, as adjusted by inflation, would truly bring about parity."

The findings and conclusions of the Canisius College Club are supported by Sar A. Levitan and Joyce K. Zickler, authors of "Swords into Plowshares: Our GI Bill." Under education and training benefits, they write—

"The cost stipend paid to the Vietnam veteran, even after it was adjusted for change in cost of living, still exceed in 1972 the amount paid to World War II and Korean veterans. Adjusted for 1972 prices, the $75 monthly payment of the World War II veteran in 1948 equaled $131. The $110 paid to the Korean veteran in 1954 adjusted for rises in cost of living, amounted to $172 and was very close to the amount received by Vietnam veterans during most of 1972. But an analysis of comparative payments to the veterans of these wars should take into consideration the overall increase of productivity and standard of living, and not just the increase in cost of living. From those calculations, it appears that society treated the World War II veteran more favorably than his successors during the two unofficial wars. Between 1948 and June, 1972, the per capita disposable income in the United States rose by 191 percent. With this as the criteria, the $75 a month allowance to the single World War II veterans in 1948 should have been raised to $218 for Vietnam veterans."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

About three of every four veterans enrolled in public colleges in 1972 paid an average annual tuition of $383. Those enrolled in private schools paid an average tuition of $1830.

In making a comparison of educational benefits, it is not sufficient to determine what payments today would be equivalent to those available to veterans of earlier wars. The real measure or value of educational benefits is the goods and services they will purchase. In this instance, what type of education is available to Vietnam veterans on the basis of current benefits, in comparison to similar benefits provided to their World War II counterparts?

Recently the Veterans Administration published information on Vietnam Era veteran GI Bill enrollment in junior and four-year colleges by States based on participation rates. Ranked on the basis of cumulative participation rates of Vietnam veterans, it is found that those states with the most highly developed low-cost public educational systems have the greatest degree of veteran participation. These participation rates ranged from 37 percent in California to 14.2 percent in Vermont.

From this, it is apparent that a strong relationship exists between state per capita expenditures on higher education and veteran participation rates. This information supports the presumption that veterans living in states that do not provide low-cost, easily accessible opportunities for higher education, benefit less from Veterans Administration educational assistance because they cannot meet the cost of education in their states.

The fact is that higher education is not uniformly accessible to today's returning veterans as it was to the veterans of World War II. Tuition rates in 1948 were generally less than the direct maximum payment of $500 to institutions for tuition, books, fees, and supplies. Consequently, the World War II veteran had access to almost any institution of higher learning in the United States. Generally—equal military service did provide equal readjustment opportunities.

To restore equity among veterans residing in different states with differing systems of public education, some form of variable payment to diminish the difference in state institutional cost is indicated.

In the judgment of The American Legion a uniform percentage increase in the existing educational assistance rates is not the best answer to the problem. At most, it would further increase the advantage of those veterans residing in states with a highly developed state-supported system of higher education.

Mr. Chairman, The American Legion believes that the answer to the clear and definite problem that exists in providing the most effective educational assistance to the greatest number of Vietnam veterans, rests in a separate payment, available to the veteran, and payable to the institution of his choice, of an amount that is reasonable and feasible, to cover the cost of tuition, fees, books and other usual student charges.

In addressing ourselves to the increased costs of education in institutions of higher learning, we should not overlook the trend that has and is occurring below the college level—in technical and vocational schools. Although we have no data showing the trend in percentage of increased costs for such programs, we have data which supports the fact that the current educational assistance payments fall considerably short of meeting the student cost of these programs. As an illustration, the following is quoted from the 1971–72 catalogue of the Ryder Technical Institute Electronics Training Center, Philadelphia.

Program	Hours	Tuition	Books and supplies	Room and board (average) per week
Electronic technology	2,000	$2,300	$250	$35
Drafting technology	2,400	2,750	125	35

Mr. Chairman, we support an amendment of Chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, so as to provide in the case of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education under such Chapter, or a half-time or more basis, other than a program exclusively by correspondence or a program of flight training, the Administrator shall pay directly to the educational institution on behalf of such veteran the customary cost of tuition (including such laboratory, library, or other similar fees as are customarily charged, as well as the costs of books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses, excluding board, lodging,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

other living expenses, and travel), which similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same courses are authorized to pay. But, in no event, shall the payment authorized exceed $1,000 for an ordinary school year. If the educational institution has no customary cost of tuition, a fair and reasonable rate of payment for tuition, fees, or other charges shall be determined by the Administrator.

In our judgment, this is a fundamental approach to the rising cost of tuition, books, and other charges. Also, the direct tuition payment would tend to equalize the educational assistance advantage for those veterans, who by choice or for other reasons, enroll in private or out-of-state public institutions.

In the context of these remarks, Mr. Chairman, we note with approval that on February 19, the House of Representatives, without dissent, passed H.R. 12628, a bill reported out of this Committee. The measure provides an increase of 13.6% in the educational assistance allowance, and includes a number of other features designed to enhance the educational assistance program. We are especially pleased at the proposed extension of eligibility to enter training from 8 to 10 years following release from active duty, and the reduction of the disability requirement for eligibility to receive vocational rehabilitation from 30% to 10%. The American Legion can support all of the provisions of H.R. 12628. It continues to be our position, however, that the preferable improvements in the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act should include provision for a method of direct tuition payment to the institution, that will facilitate the veteran's ability to enter training, and broaden the range of choice of institutions available to him.

In support of our statement we have attached: (1) a table of comparison of GI Bill educational benefits available to veterans of World War II, and those of the Vietnam Era, (2) a table of comparison of U.S. average monthly earnings to GI Bill benefits for veterans in selected years, (3) a tabulation of veterans estimated 9-month budget, excluding tuition and fees, 1972–73 school year, and (4) a tabulation of tuition, books, and supplies, and remainder of benefits available to veterans for living expenses at selected 4-year public institutions, 1972–73.

Thank you for receiving the views of The American Legion.

COMPARISON OF GI BILL EDUCATION BENEFITS (BASED ON SINGLE VETERAN RATE (COLLEGE) 9-MONTH SCHOOL YEAR)

	Average tuition	Average books and supplies	VA allowance (9 months)	VA allowance less tuition, books, and supplies: Amount	VA allowance less tuition, books, and supplies: Difference from World War II
World War II 1946–49 school year:					
Public (current dollars)	$140.00	$50.00	$675.00		
Public (constant dollars)[2]	268.16	95.97	1,292.90	$1,292.90	
Private (current dollars)	396.00	50.00	675.00		
Private (constant dollars)	758.50	95.77	1,292.90	1,292.90	
Vietnam Era (compared to World War II)[3] 1973–74 school year:					
Public (current dollars)	419.00	[4] 216.00	1,980.00	1,345.00	$+52.10
Private (current dollars)	1,997.00	216.00	1,980.00	233.00	−1,525.90

[1] Ceiling limitation of $500 on tuition, books, and supplies; ceiling limitation on earnings plus subsistence, single veteran—$210 per month; veteran with 1 dependent—$270 per month; and veteran with 2 or more dependents—$290 per month.

[2] 1973–74 constant dollars based on Consumer Price Index 1967=100; 1948 average=72.1; (December) 1973 average=138.5; ratio=1.92.

[4] Mean amount reported by veteran students filing student financial statements with the college scholarship service 1972–73 school year.

[3] A measure of the real value of educational benefits or what dollar amount in benefits would be required to provide parity in purchasing an education between the veteran of World War II and his Vietnam counterpart may be ascertained by adjusting the World War II subsistence benefits and educational benefits for changes that have occurred in the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

From the above tabulation, it is apparent that the average single veteran attending a public institution of higher learning has educational benefits slightly higher than his World War II counterpart when adjustments for changes in the Consumer Price Index are made.

To the extent that a Vietnam veteran is not average, i.e., attending an institution where the tuition exceeds the U.S. average of $419 for a public institution, then his benefits are less than those available to the veteran of World War II.

Clearly there is a wide variance the funds available to the veteran for living expenses, depending upon the State of residence and the public or private institution available to him.

The Vietnam veteran student desiring to attend a private institution, is severely disadvantaged with respect to the veteran of World War II. The average tuition of private institutions, coupled with the cost of books and supplies, requires the Vietnam veteran with current benefits of $1,980 per school year to raise an additional $233 just to meet educational costs, leaving literally nothing for subsistence.

COMPARISON OF U.S. AVERAGE MONTHLY EARNINGS TO GI BILL BENEFITS FOR VETERANS IN SELECTED YEARS

	1948	Percent of average monthly earnings	October 1973	Percent of average monthly earnings
Average monthly earnings	$212		$640	
Monthly payments:				
No dependents	75	35.4	220	34.4
After tuition at 4-yr college [1]			149	23.2
After tuition at 2-yr college [1]			171	26.7
1 dependent	105	49.5	261	40.8
After tuition at 4-yr college [1]			190	29.7
After tuition at 2-yr college [1]			212	33.1
2 dependents	120	56.6	298	46.6
After tuition at 4-yr college [1]			227	35.5
After tuition at 2-yr college [1]			249	38.9

[1] A monthly charge of $70.55 for public 4-yr institutions and $48.67 for 2-yr public institutions, derived from average tuition, fees, books, and supplies is deducted from the appropriate October 1973 GI benefit payment. 4-yr institution—Tuition books, etc. $819, 216, $635 per 9 equal $70.55 monthly. 2-yr institution—Tuition books, etc. $222, 216, per $438 per 9 equal $48.67 monthly.

Veterans Estimated 9-Mo. Budget Excluding Tuition and Fees, 1972-73 School Year

	Single	Married No Children	Married With Children
VA allowance (9-mo (HL)	$1,930	$2,349	[1] $2,844
4-yr public:			
Average tuition, fees, books and supplies	635	635	635
Benefits available for subsistence	1,345	1,714	2,029
Estimated living expenses	1,973	3,358	4,241
Additional resources needed	628	1,644	2,032

[1] VA allowance based on amount payable to a married veteran with 3 children.

COSTS OF TUITION, BOOKS AND SUPPLIES, AND REMAINDER OF BENEFITS AVAILABLE FOR LIVING EXPENSES AT SELECTED 4-YEAR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS, 1972-73

College or university	GI bill benefits	Tuition [1]	Average books and supply costs	Remainder for living expenses [2]	Living funds for 1 month [3]
University of California	$1,980	$644	$216	$1,120	$124.44
Florida State	1,980	570	216	1,194	132.67
University of Illinois	1,980	0	216	1,764	196.00
University of Massachusetts	1,980	0	216	1,764	196.00
University of Michigan	1,980	696	216	1,068	118.67
University of Missouri	1,980	540	216	1,224	136.00
State University of New York	1,980	740-890	216	1,024-874	113.78-97.11
University of North Carolina	1,980	422	216	1,342	149.11
Pennsylvania State University	1,980	855	216	909	101.00
Texas Tech University	1,980	252	216	1,512	168.00

[1] Office of Information and Research, Washington, D.C. Reports show on the average that nonresidents' tuition and/or required fees were 255 percent higher than charged residents of the State.

[2] "Nonresidents, because of increased tuition and/or fees costs, will have less funds available from the GI bill benefit to meet the costs of living expenses.

[3] Veterans are exempt from payment of tuition.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Wolff, have you any questions?

Mr. WOLFF. I just want to thank the American Legion for its support of this program. The Legion has always been cooperative supporting changing attitudes of changing wars. Each time we have a new group of veterans, the American Legion has come forth with support for its veterans. Thank you very much.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Zwach, have you any questions?

Mr. ZWACH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is very fine to hear from you gentlemen again.

On page 8 you give some participation figures, and you state that these participation rates range from 37 percent in California to 14.2 percent in Vermont.

Now, I think previous testimony indicated about 51.5 percent over the years have participated. Is there anything particular about these figures? Only 14.2 percent of veterans that went into service during the Vietnam era have taken advantage of the educational offerings under the legislation? What is this 14.2 percent to which you refer?

Mr. GOLEMBIESKI. That 14.2 percent figure was taken from the Educational Testing Service report table, and this was based on data derived from the Veterans Administration enrollment in junior and 4-year colleges by State, based on the participation rates. Those States where they have a highly developed public school system, tax supported by the State, veterans living in such a State are able to advantage themselves of the schools that have low-cost tuition.

Mr. ZWACH. This is practically a 2½ to 1 ratio—37 percent down to 14?

Mr. GOLEMBIESKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. It is difficult to believe only 14 percent of the veterans in Vermont take advantage of this program. Perhaps there are some other things that enter into this. It would just be amazing if that would be true, and especially from previous testimony we have showing figures that 51.5 percent of the veterans have taken advantage of this program.

Mr. GOLEMBIESKI. Another part of the report indicates—it is on table 6 of the ETS study, page 37, and it shows the veteran college study participation in the 4-year public and private—looking at all college students, 49 percent of them are in public schools, 4-year type; 28 percent are in the 2-year type; and 23 percent in private colleges. It would seem that the Vietnam era veterans is utilizing his entitlement, and making it stretch by going to the 2-year-type community college, and then perhaps laying enough money aside to complete his education at the senior college level.

Mr. ZWACH. And you do find, then, a tremendous difference in the number of veterans that participate in the program when you relate it to the type college facilities that are available and the cost of those facilities?

Mr. GOLEMBIESKI. That seems to be the way the statistics are evaluated.

Mr. ZWACH. I appreciate your comments on this.

Mr. Chairman, that is all.

Mr. HERSTOSKI. Do you have any questions of the witness, Mr. Walsh?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, I am awful sorry I had to miss your testimony. I was called out. I will look it over very carefully, I assure you.

Mr. HERSTOSKI. I have no questions except to comment on page 8. I think you have a very good statement there—"The real measure or value of educational benefits is the goods and services they will purchase." That is really what we should be paying attention to in terms of the Vietnam veteran. I think it is a very good statement.

I would like to thank you for your testimony here this morning, and I certainly appreciate your giving your time and the summarization of the need for this kind of a program. Thank you very much.

We have one final witness for this morning, Mr. James Mayer, who is the president of the National Association of Concerned Veterans. Mr. Mayer, you may proceed.

I would like to welcome you to the committee, and you can begin when you are ready.

Mr. MAYER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank also the members of the subcommittee for the opportunity to appear before you once again. I realize the pressures on time. I think you will find our statement is very short and to the point.

STATEMENT OF JAMES M. MAYER, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CONCERNED VETERANS

Mr. MAYER. On October 10, 1973, the subcommittee decided to separate a variable tuition concept, sponsored by Congressman Walsh, from a broad package of GI bill amendments. Your sound reasoning for that move was legitimate concern over a probable veto of the entire package because of Office of Management and Budget—OMB—opposition to veterans' tuition assistance. The amendments that you did approve became H.R. 12628 and passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 382 to 0 on February 19. NACV is very grateful for the 13.6-percent raise in the GI bill allowances and other improvements provided by your bipartisan efforts behind H.R. 12628.

However, you now meet to consider the merits of a proposal that goes to the very heart of Vietnam era veterans' current difficulties in attaining an education. The Walsh provision, or more formally H.R. 11134, provides for reimbursing a veteran annually for tuition costs above $419 and below $1,000, or maximum $600 a year.

A New York Times article of March 25—which is attached—reveals that the college entrance examination board predicts a 9.4-percent increase in the cost of a college education for the fall of 1974. This will mean a 35.8 percent rise in education costs since the fall of 1970, and is bad news for students—particularly those who have families to support. The majority of Vietnam era veterans eligible for the GI bill do have families to support.

The Educational Testing Service—ETS—study of veterans' educational and training benefits concluded, because of vast variances in the State-by-State GI bill participation rates and mixed availability of low-cost education, that a variable tuition allowance was needed to provide equal treatment for equal military service. H.R. 11134 fits that description perfectly.

I call your attention to the chart attached to my testimony immediately after the New York Times article. These figures indicate that the current GI bill creates wide discrepancies in funds available for veterans' living expenses after tuition and book costs are paid at some major public institutions. NACV believes as Mr. Walsh pointed out earlier, that the inequities are apparent.

NACV fully recognizes that opposition exists to the return to WWII GI bill policy of tuition payments made directly to institutions. However, it seems H.R. 11134 strikes a fair and realistic compromise by designing the veteran as the recipient of the tuition assistance—not the school. Therefore, the possibilities of institutional abuses, such as those after WWII, are effectively eliminated.

The all-important product of the enactment of H.R. 11134 would be the establishment of a true parity between the educational opportunities offered Vietnam era veterans and those offered to their WWII

counterparts. That is to say, Vietnam era veterans would gain from H.R. 11134 a fundamental educational asset—freedom of choice.

One additional consideration in such a reform as H.R. 11134 is the estimate of general congressional support for such a concept.

On February 18, NACV mailed a survey to all Members of the House and Senate. The purpose of this survey was to ascertain congressional opinions on the major conclusions of the ETS study. On February 28, Chairman Helstoski graciously publicized the survey in the Congressional Record and encouraged fellow Members of Congress to participate.

NACV has now received 65 replies to our original mailing in what seems to be a representative sample. Item 4 of the survey specifically bears on the equity of the current GI bill. The item, which is a quote from the ETS study, reads:

> The veteran residing in a state with a well-developed system of low-cost institutions has significantly more of his benefits available to help defray living expenses than would his counterpart living in a state without such a system * * * Current benefit levels, requiring as they do the payment (by veterans themselves) of tuition, fees, books and supplies, and living expenses, provide the basis for "unequal treatment of equals".

Eighty-four percent of the responding members agreed with that statement. At the very least, this majority suggests strong congressional awareness of the inequities of the current benefit structure.

NACV respectfully requests this subcommittee to approve H.R. 11134 as expeditiously as possible. Thank you. This is the end of my prepared statement.

If I could take approximately 1½ minutes for some very personal observations. Next week marks the end of my official term as president of the National Association of Concerned Veterans. I have been involved in this voluntary effort for 2 years now. I would like to thank the subcommittee very sincerely for allowing me to be a part of some of the actions during the 93d Congress. I have been impressed very much by the ranking minority who have strived for bipartisan efforts in the best interest of the Vietnam era veterans. As we approach tomorrow, Vietnam Veterans Day, national observance of those who did serve the era of this most recent conflict, I believe, the best step available to this subcommittee is to give favorable approval to H.R. 11134 as soon as possible.

Thank you very much.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you for coming. This committee has always tried to be as bipartisan as possible in its approach to the problems of veterans. Consequently, work of your group and other service organizations have contributed to solving these problems.

Mr. Zwach, do you have any questions?

Mr. ZWACH. I really appreciate your very, very reasonable presentation. It strengthens my faith in the youth of our great Nation and our great future because of such youth.

Mr. MAYER. I thank you, sir, and I think the work that is going on here that lies ahead of the subcommittee and other Members of the Congress is, in turn, restoring faith in those who served in the system and in the Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Mayer, I want to compliment you on a very fine statement. I think it is very fine. You bring out in your opening para-

graph the fact that we did propose this bill originally as an amendment to the original GI bill for the Vietnam veteran era and it was withdrawn. The estimate of the cost we received from the Veterans' Administration is $400 and some million that this would cost. The reason I then agreed to withdraw the amendment was that the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Helstoski, assured me there would be hearings on the bill, and I am grateful to him for doing that. I am pleased that you brought out the fact there is strong congressional support for this type of benefit and I am convinced if we can get the bill onto the floor of Congress we can get it passed, and again I want to compliment you on what I am sure is a very, productive year during your term of office and good luck at whatever you do in the future.

Mr. MAYER. Thank you very much.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. No further questions of the witness.

We want to thank you, Mr. Mayer, for coming before us and adding to the testimony.

The meeting is adjourned until April 2, at 10 a.m.

[Whereupon, at 12 noon, the meeting was adjourned until April 2, 1974, at 10 a.m.]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SEPARATE TUITION PAYMENTS FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING
OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 10:15 a.m., in room 334, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Henry Helstoski (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. The meeting will come to order.

These hearings are a continuation of hearings on the bill H.R. 11134, which provides for supplemental tuition payments to veterans. We have had 1 day of hearings, and we are beginning the second today.

At the outset, let me first of all insert in the record statements by the Honorable William D. Ford, the Honorable Frank Thompson, Jr., William S. Cohen, Joseph Addabbo, and Richard W. Mallary.

[The statements referred to follow:]

STATEMENT BY HON. WILLIAM D. FORD, REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Education and Training I appreciate this opportunity to comment on this important legislation that would equalize educational benefits for all Vietnam veterans.

It was brought to our attention a few months ago that the Veterans' Administration commissioned the Educational Testing Service to prepare a report on the GI education bill. The result of these findings showed that the GI bill for Vietnam era veterans fell far short of its world war two predecessor. The World War Two program not only provided those like me, who used it with a monthly subsistence allowance, but took care of virtually all tuition costs, books, and supplies. The present GI bill, in contrast, provides veterans with only a monthly subsistence allowance which must be stretched to cover not only our high cost of living but also our high cost of education.

As I'm sure all of you know the price tag for education differs in every State. The monthly subsistence allowance that veterans presently receive does not begin to cover the costs of schooling in high cost public education states. There are hundreds of thousands of veterans, especially in states where public education is extremely high who simply cannot afford to take advantage of their GI education benefits.

Thus the present GI education program does afford equal educational opportunities for all our veterans. This was not the case, however, after World War Two when we could pick and choose not only from public schools but private schools as well. This legislation will amend the basic unequal structure of the current GI bill. It would authorize the Veteran's Administration to reimburse a veteran for tuition costs above $419 approximately the national average tuition pay- . . . with the VA's payment not exceeding $600. This plan would serve to nalize educational opportunities to all veterans no matter where they reside.

Yesterday the House voted to release $750 million in supplemental funds to re-adjust educational benefits to veterans. Now that enrollment for educational

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

benefits under the Vietnam GI Bill has risen sharply this fiscal year, this legislation is definitely a step in the right direction. We must bring the present GI bill on a par with its World War Two predecessor so we can fulfill the obligation we have to those who have served.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR., REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Committee for this opportunity to testify in behalf of H.R. 13433, a bill to equalize educational benefits for all Vietnam veterans.

In recent weeks, the House has acted to meet the financial needs of Vietnam veterans now enrolled in school by passing the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974. However, there are thousands of veterans across the country who still cannot pay initial tuition fees and thus cannot take advantage of the G.I. Bill. This is particularly true for those veterans who reside in states such as New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania where public education costs are relatively high. In New Jersey, for example, tuition fees range from $535 to $585, in state colleges and state universities. These sums are significantly more than tuition fees in states with low-cost public education, such as California and Texas. A veteran's inability to raise an initial tuition payment of $585 effectively forecloses his participation in an education or training program.

H.R. 13433 would provide a direct tuition payment to a veteran who must meet fees which exceed the national average of $400. Thus an eligible veteran would pay the first $400, and the Veterans Administration would reimburse him for additional tuition costs up to a total cost of $1,000. This supplemental payment program will enable veterans in states with high public education costs to utilize G.I. benefits, and would help provide equal educational opportunities for all veterans, regardless of where they reside.

H.R. 13433 will help to bring educational benefits of the Vietnam G.I. Bill up to par with those provided in the World War II G.I. Bill. We must do everything in our power to eliminate the present financial barriers which prevent the veteran of the Vietnam War from receiving an education and the opportunity for a better life. I strongly urge the Committee to approve H.R. 13433.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM S. COHEN, REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF MAINE

Mr. Chairman: I am very pleased to have this opportunity to submit my views on the legislation being considered by your Sub-committee to improve veterans' educational benefits. I would like to compliment the Sub-committee on the initiative it has taken to make this Nation more responsive to the needs of our veterans.

A study conducted by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, indicates that the present GI Bill does not meet today's soaring living and education costs. Since the GI Bill was enacted following World War II the cost of living has risen 141.9%; yet, the total benefits a Vietnam veteran can receive per school year has increased only about 40%.

The ETS study further pointed out that the ability of a Vietnam veteran to take advantage of his education benefits depends more on the state in which he resides than on any other factor. In too many cases, instate tuition is so high that the veteran is discouraged from even beginning his education, let alone having a choice of which school he would like to attend. In recognition of the need to rectify this situation, I am pleased to join several of my colleagues in the House in co-sponsoring H.R. 13184.

This bill provides a partial tuition payment plan which would offset the differences that exist in higher education costs from State to State. According to studies conducted by the Veterans Administration, the average tuition cost of a 4-year public institution is slightly higher than $400.00. That average increases when private schools are included. If this bill is adopted, the veteran would be responsible for paying the first $419. He would be reimbursed by the VA for tuition costs above $419 up to a total of $1,019. Out of a total tuition cost of $1,019, then, the veteran would pay $419, and the VA would pay the remaining $600.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In my State, such a tuition equalizer is particularly necessary. With an estimated Vietnam veteran population of 32,000, only 8,800 veterans have availed themselves of an education through the GI Bill during the past 5 years. Of the 3,000 veterans attending institutions of higher education in the State today, two-thirds are paying tuition costs in excess of $400. In short, 77% of these young men are not pursuing a higher education, while in the state as a whole 51% of those graduating from high school go on to college.

Support for equal educational assistance for all veterans has been a major tenet of the Congress since World War II. However, inflation has had the effect of reducing the number of veterans enrolled in college programs from 50% of eligible World War II veterans to 21% of those eligible today. It is time for us to bring the attention of the Country to the forgotten young veteran and to provide him assistance, at least to the degree that we did his father. In order to achieve this goal, it is evident that more time and more money are needed if our veterans are to meet their educational objectives. I believe that H.R. 13184 is a major effort in correcting deficiencies and inequities in the law and I hope it will receive speedy consideration.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to present my views to you and the Committee in support of H.R. 13184, legislation to authorize supplemental educational assistance allowance payments for Vietnam veterans. As a co-sponsor of this measure, I also want to express my personal appreciation to the Chairman for making it possible for witnesses from veterans organizations and other interested persons to testify on the proposal.

Never before in our history have returning veterans faced the kind of apathy which exists today with regard to those who served in Vietnam. Because of the nature of that war and the division within our country over the policies of the United States in Southeast Asia, the returning Vietnam veterans presents a picture which many Americans have chosen to ignore. That is a tragic and cruel error.

The men who served in Vietnam did so notwithstanding the kind of public support they had every right to expect and notwithstanding the disruption to their own lives which resulted from the draft. These veterans merit our highest praise and our concern now that they try to reenter society.

Their reentry comes at a time when inflation has run rampant over our entire economy, when jobs are scarce, and when confusion and uncertainty—economic, political, and social—are the order of the day. Predictions of recession and the energy crisis are extra problems to be faced by the returning veteran.

The tuition benefits provided by the legislation before the Committee represent one small way in which Congress can express the support of a Nation for service rendered under the most difficult of circumstances. The Committee has heard testimony from organizations of veterans which are familiar with the complex problems faced by the Vietnam veteran and the Committee has also heard from Members of the House of Representatives who have co-sponsored this bill. H.R. 13184 is a limited proposal to supplement tuition expenses for the Vietnam veteran up to a maximum of $600 for a school year.

The cost of this legislation is minimal when compared to the risks taken by the Vietnam veteran and the injuries sustained by him in the line of duty. The bill deserves your support and I join those who are urging your favorable consideration of this legislation as quickly as possible.

STATEMENT BY HON. RICHARD W. MALLARY, REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF VERMONT

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the Members of this Subcommittee for permitting me to address the topic of improving educational benefits for veterans of the Vietnam era.

I was extremely pleased with the House passage of H.R. 12628, which, among other things, provided an increase in educational benefits for Vietnam-era veterans. At that time, Congress made clear that it not only recognized the inadequacy of veterans educational aid but intended to do something about it. The

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

unanimous approval of that measure was a positive indication of Congressional resolve.

The 13.6% increase in monthly payments will provide welcome assistance for those desiring to further their education. Yet, two important facts convince me that we must design some needed flexibility into the system. First, paying rising tuition costs leaves the veteran very little for other educational or living expenses. Second, tuition costs vary widely from school to school, state to state.

A flat, across-the-board increase does indeed provide added assistance but in varying degrees. Such an increase will take some of the bite out of paying for tuition charges but will aid those veterans more who want to attend or are attending schools with relatively lower tuition costs.

For this reason, I have joined with some of my colleagues in co-sponsoring H.R. 13433, to authorize additional payments to eligible veterans to partially defray the cost of tuition. I believe this legislation to be a realistic supplement to the recent measure approved by the House and I strongly support its provisions.

During discussions preceding the passage of H.R. 12628, many Members emphasized that a veteran living in a certain state and desiring to attend a public college or university in that state often found that even the favorable tuition fees offered to residents were beyond his or her means. This individual was faced with the unfair choice of foregoing further education, attending school part-time and working to supplement his veterans educational benefits or relocating in another state offering lower tuition rates to residents.

My colleagues from New England are well aware of the difficult position many of our veterans are in. I would like to point out in particular, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, the situation of veterans in my state of Vermont. While the national average for resident tuition charged for public two-year and four-year colleges and universities is $419, the in-State tuition charge at the University of Vermont for 1974-1975 will be increased to $950, more than twice the national average.

In addition, the Veterans' Administration has supplied me with some interesting, although not very encouraging, statistics on how many eligible Vermont Vietnam-era veterans participate in benefits for education programs. As of November, 1973, out of 16,000 Vietnam-era veterans in Vermont 4,903 were participating in these programs. This comes to 30.6%. Nationally, 3,400,000 out of 6,787,000 were participating or about 50%. Out of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, Vermont ranks 51st, on the bottom of the list of veterans usage of educational benefits. There is certainly a correlation between this low utilization of the program in Vermont and our relatively higher tuition rates making it impossible for many veterans to further their education here.

I would like to see this number increased. In Vermont, we encourage our young people to seek an education, work and remain in our state if that is their wish. The same wish applies to our veterans as well. I believe that the program proposed by H.R. 13433 would have an important applicability to Vermont and to other areas of the nation. I encourage its favorable consideration by this Subcommittee and the Congress.

Mr. HELSOSKI. We will hear the testimony of the Honorable William F. Walsh.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. WALSH. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I am indeed pleased to be here this morning before my colleagues on this subcommittee, and I would like to sincerely commend you for taking the initiative and scheduling these most important hearings.

Since last October 25, when I first conceived and introduced H.R. 11134, which for the first time since World War II set forth the principle of tuition supplement, the reaction of my colleagues, the press, and the many thousands of veterans directly concerned has been overwhelming.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

With the untiring efforts of Mr. Wolff, Mrs. Heckler, yourself, and other individuals too numerous to mention, there are now more than 60 cosponsors of this legislation and many more have expressed an avid interest.

On the Senate side, more than one-third of that body's membership have cosponsored legislation containing this provision.

It is readily apparent to all of us that these hearings are the beginning of consideration of an idea which has gained considerable momentum over the past few months. On behalf of all of the veterans of America, I would like first to say a heartfelt thanks to everyone who has helped bring us this far.

Mr. Chairman, last Friday was Vietnam Veterans Day, with parades and rallies throughout the country. It was proclaimed by the President to honor the Vietnam vet, but a simple proclamation is meaningless without something substantive to back it up.

Today's veteran is angry, and rightfully so, that he has served his country well and is receiving only a token thank you in terms of educational and other benefits. His counterpart from World War II, in actual dollars, received far more assistance in obtaining his college degree.

This point will be elaborated on more by our colleague, Mr. Conte, later this morning, but the attached information, marked "Exhibit A," shows the wide disparity between the two GI bills.

The key point to remember is that the $220 now being given to the single veteran, and this figure does not reflect the increase the House passed recently, represents the amount that went to the World War II veteran for living expenses.

The $75 in the 1940's is now worth about $220 when you use the criteria of average U.S. monthly earnings instead of the Consumer Price Index as is presently the case in the Veterans' Administration.

Using the CPI as a guideline, the Congress would have just recently raised the 40-cent-per-hour minimum wage of 1948 to 81 cents. This index is simply not an accurate reflection of a dollar's worth.

Using the percentage of average U.S. monthly earnings, that $75 for living expenses is today worth $220, ironically what today's vet gets for all expenses. In addition to the $75, the World War II vet also got an amount that effectively paid for all of his tuition, books, and fees. Today's vet is simply not getting the help he so desperately needs and so rightly deserves.

What I propose in my bill is to pay a part of the tuition costs faced by the veteran. As the attached materials in exhibit B show, the national average for tuition in 2- and 4-year public colleges and universities is $417 per school year. This figure has been accepted by the Veterans' Administration and is now fairly widely accepted as the best available estimate.

Using this as the base figure, I propose that the veteran pay everything up to and including $419 and that he receive everything over that figure up to a maximum of $600 per school year. In other words, we will pay him the difference between $419 and the tuition he actually pays per school year, but once that tuition exceeds $1,019, he will still only receive $600.

It is our intention that the funds be paid to the veteran directly but that safeguards be taken to prevent abuse.

In its report on this proposal, the Veterans' Administration estimates the cost of the program to be $1.1 billion over the next 5 fiscal years. This figure includes all veterans in private colleges and universities and it is assumed that each of them would receive the maximum benefit of $600.

In addition, they estimate that 45 percent of all veterans are now above the national average and that by fiscal year 1979 that percenatge will increase to 70 percent.

Finally, the Veterans' Administration estimates that 2 percent of veterans will switch from public to private schools as a result of this program.

My estimates, as again exhibit B shows, are lower than these figures, but they do not include the tuition for private institutions. Therefore, I feel that the Veterans' Administration figures are a reasonable estimate of the actual dollar cost for this program.

I would also like to take this opportunity to address some of the criticisms of this proposal offered by the Veterans' Administration in their report and in their testimony last Thursday.

First, the statement that a return to this type of tuition aid would reopen the door to the abuses which occurred in the earlier program.

In the first place, this money will be going directly to the veteran and not to the school. We have seen fit to trust the veteran with a check for his current benefits and he has responded by using these funds for their intended purpose.

I see no reason to believe that he will not do the same thing with the additional necessary moneys he would receive from the program.

In the second place, this statement on the part of the Veterans' Administration seems to be an open admission of inability to deal administratively with the program. While this feeling may have some merit in certain other instances, on the whole the Veterans' Administration is staffed with capable people who have sufficient administrative skills to carry out such a proposal and if additional assistance is needed, I am sure the Congress would cooperate in every way it can.

Any potential abuses can, I feel, be curtailed by the actions of this committee and the Veterans' Administration.

A key point raised by the Veterans' Administration was that of equal benefits for equal service. I could not agree more with this concept and, in fact, it is the catchphrase of our program to enact the tuition supplement provision.

The Veterans' Administration says that this equality already exists; I feel the evidence overwhelmingly shows this not to be the case and that H.R. 11134 will help provide true equality.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, you clearly pointed out last Thursday that the Educational Testing Service refuted the Veterans' Administration claim made last year that today's vet is on an equal footing with the veteran of World War II.

To clear up any further possible misunderstandings, I would like to request that a copy of that ETS study and a summary of its findings and conclusions be made a part of the hearing record.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of education, like everything else today, is spiraling upward. The unemployment rate for veterans is inordinately

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

high, but a proper education will help alleviate this. But only if the veteran can afford to attend the college of his choice.

The veteran has made a major contribution to his country. He has risked his life for low pay over a period of years. The benefits he receives following separation from the service were earned many times over. They are well-deserved.

If, as Mr. Wolff so eloquently stated last week, we can spend $600 million to stabilize the economy of South Vietnam, we can certainly grant much-needed educational assistance to our young men who served this great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely urge you and all of my colleagues to act quickly and favorably on this proposal so that those who served this country in a time of need can receive all of the benefits to which they are entitled. It is a trite phrase often used, but this is truly an idea whose time has come.

Mr. Chairman, that finishes my statement.

I would like to have made a part of the record a letter from William F. Claire, who is director of the Washington office of the State University of New York. He is attached to the office of the chancellor.

I would just like to read the second paragraph of this letter. It is addressed to me.

> Studies have shown that proportionally fewer veterans in New York and on the East Coast have participated in educational programs for a variety of reasons. The measures you have sponsored will result in a higher level of financial support to veterans and will assist them in meeting increasing costs of education. This program should make participation possible for larger numbers of veterans in all institutions of post-secondary education.

Mr. Chairman, that completes my testimony.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Are exhibits A and B part of your testimony, Mr. Walsh?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; they are.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Without objection, they will be made a part of the record, in addition to the letter you just indicated.

[The exhibits and letter follow:]

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1974.

Hon. WILLIAM F. WALSH,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALSH: As the House Subcommittee on Education and Training, Committee on Veterans Affairs, begins consideration of HR 13433, which you have sponsored, we want to take this opportunity to express our appreciation and support for your efforts to provide greater educational opportunities for veterans.

Studies have shown that proportionately fewer veterans in New York and on the East Coast have participated in educational programs for a variety of reasons. The measures you have sponsored will result in a higher level of financial support to veterans and will assist them in meeting increasing costs of education. This program should make participation possible for larger numbers of veterans in all institutions of postsecondary education.

Both the veterans and their institutions will benefit from the programs you have proposed. You have our sincere gratitude for your efforts in behalf of our veterans.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. CLAIRE,
Director, Washington Office.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Exhibit A

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
November 5, 1973.

Memorandum

To: John Gunther, Executive Director, USCM; Allen Pritchard, Executive Vice President, NLC

From: Stuart Feldman, Veteran Coordinator

Re: Summary Fact Sheet on Adequacy of GI Bill Educational Assistance for Vets

Recent Studies.—A recent study compiled for the V.A. by the Educational Testing Service concludes that the Vietnam veteran has less purchasing power for a four year college education than did the vet of World War II, when adjustments are made for cost of living increases. In addition, they find that whether or not a Vietnam vet can take advantage of his GI Bill benefits depends more on the state in which he resides than upon any other factor.

GI Bill Formulae.—The present formula for distributing GI Bill benefits gives veterans a lump sum of $220 per month, or $1,980 per academic year. Out of this he must pay all educational fees and tuition, plus his living expenses. During WW II, the GI Bill paid for effectively all tuition, books and educational fees—payments going directly to the college chosen by the veteran. In addition, it paid each veteran $75 per month for living expenses. The lumping of all benefits into one $220 per month payment for today's vets should not give the false impression that this is a living allowance comparable to the $75 per month received in WW II.

Consumer Price Index Test.—Although changes in the Consumer Price Index are used by the V.A. to defend the adequacy of present benefits, if taken as a major economic indicator, these changes fall short of giving a valid economic profile. For example, if Congress had used the CPI as the measure of what today's minimum wage ought to be, it would have recently voted in an $.81 per hour minimum wage. This indicates the increase, based on the CPI, which has accrued since the $.40 per hour minimum wage of 1945.

GI Bill and Monthly Earnings.—In 1948, the $75 per month living allowance received by vets represented 35.4% of average U.S. monthly earnings as determined by the Labor Department. Using that measure today, 35.4% of average U.S. monthly earnings represents $220 per month—ironically the payment Vietnam veterans receive to cover not only living costs but all educational expenses.

State Differences.—Unless a veteran lives in a state with a large number of community colleges or inexpensive four year colleges, his chances of gaining a higher education are minimal. States like California offer vets $200 per year tuition at public colleges, while almost Ohio and New Jersey charge $500 to $800. Many states in New England and other sections of the East have relied by nearly 50% on private institutions to provide their higher education. The veteran is, in reality priced out of the private tuition category, such tuition having increased five fold since 1945, averaging out to almost $2,000.

Jobs and Veterans.—Additional advantages which were available to WW II veterans constitute an out-of-pocket expense for the Vietnam vet. Special housing subsidies as well as quonset hut, inexpensive student housing was available. No such housing assistance exists today. An abundance of full and part-time job resulting from the economic boom in post WW II years made it relatively easy for a vet to supplement his benefits with real income. Such is hardly the case today, with veterans' unemployment consistently above national averages, having reached 460,000 or 16% in 1972.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE GI BILL—WORLD WAR II AND TODAY

A summary comparison of World War II and today's GI Bills follows, with an evaluation of the impact those differences make:

GI Bill paid for all tuition, books and fees (effectively) at any public or private college or technical school.	No direct tuition payment to schools—a flat $220 a month to the vet. Education costs at many colleges are five times greater than in 1948.
A monthly subsistence allowance of $75—equal to one third of the average U.S. worker's monthly earnings.	Average monthly earnings almost triple. Vet must cover living costs plus tuition from $220 per month. In many areas, this barely covers rent and food.
Part-time jobs readily available.	Tight job market has made part-time jobs hard to find.
Public colleges paid out-of-state tuition by the federal government for vets. Colleges and technical schools eagerly recruited vets. Led to expansion of higher education.	Vets pay in-state tuition rates at public colleges from their $220. Out-of-state charge at U of Cal is $2160; total GI Bill is $1080; vet pays $880. Colleges have few significant vets programs.

In large part because of the funding differences between the World War II and today's GI Bills, the effectiveness of the GI Bill is uneven, particularly for college and junior college education and for institutional non-college training.

(1) *Great regional disparities in GI Bill use.* California has a 36% GI Bill use rate; New York, 20%; Massachusetts, 18%; Pennsylvania and Ohio, 16%. In fiscal 1972, California vets used $302,000,000 in GI Bill benefits; New York vets used $81,000,000.

(2) *Equal military service means unequal opportunity.* Since today's veteran pays tuition out of his GI Bill, veterans in states with cheap public colleges end up with considerably more subsistence money than those from states whose public colleges charge higher tuition; for example, California State at Los Angeles charges $117, while Jersey City State charges $635, a difference of $518, leaving the New Jersey veteran with $1,365 to live on for nine months, while the California veteran has $1,882—almost $500 more.

(3) *Veterans are a smaller percentage of college students.* After World War II, veterans were 50% of all enrollees in college. Today they are 5%. Although there was a larger universe of eligible World War II veterans—15,000,000 versus 6,220,000 Vietnam-era veterans—today's veterans are still a large potential audience. Higher levels of education in the population and the greater availability of junior colleges result in a higher percentage of veterans using their opportunities for college—23.4% versus 20.8% after Korea, and 14.5% after World War II.

(4) *Use is inverse to need.* Roughly 20% of the 6,220,000 Vietnam-era veterans have pre-service college; 20% are high school dropouts; and 60% are high school graduates. High school dropouts have about a 20% use rate, while those with pre-service college have a 50% use rate, and high school graduates have close to a 50% rate. But the dropouts and high school graduates make the greatest use of the GI Bill for correspondence courses, with 800,000 persons having done so; 75% of these, according to a GAO study, dropped out prior to completion.

(5) *Percent of federal budget devoted.* After World War II, the GI Bill took 7.5% of the federal budget; today it takes 1%.

(6) *Ruled out of private colleges, with fewer at state universities.* Today veterans comprise only 1% of total enrollment at Holy Cross, Northwestern and Yale; veterans can no longer afford most private colleges, and represent less than 10% of the student body at major state universities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
October 15, 1973.

Memorandum

To: Allen Pritchard and John Gunther
From: Stuart Feldman
Re: *Vietnam Veterans Lack Equal Opportunity with That of World War II Veterans in Obtaining a Four-Year College Education*

Today's veteran seeking a four-year public college education in many states is at a drastic disadvantage in comparison with his World War II counterpart. The average cost of tuition and living varies greatly from state to state. What the veteran has to live on depends on what he has left after paying for tuition and books. Since today's veteran receives a flat $220 a month, veterans in different states and even at different schools within the same state have different sums of money for subsistence. Under the World War II GI Bill, all veterans received the same subsistence allowances after payment of tuition at public colleges.

GI Bill Payments in Today's Dollars.—The basic line of defense of today's level of benefits is that on the average, the veteran has more benefit dollars than his World War II counterpart. But at four-year public universities in states with large concentrations of veterans, using current cost of living indexes, the veteran, after three increases in GI Bill benefits, has a sum only $6.00 per month more than did his World War II counterpart. While every veteran of World War II could command a four year public education, today's veteran can only do so and still have enough money to live on if he attends a college with a tuition charge equal to or below the national average of $419. By definition, approximately 50% of the veterans using today's GI Bill are attending schools with tuition charges above $419 and thus have less than World War II veterans.

Even at a college at or below the average public college tuition charge, parity with WW II is illusory, for veterans at that time had subsidized housing available in the form of traditional quonset huts. The figures contained in Table 1 show that it was only the October 1972 increase that brought the Vietnam-era veteran within even striking distance of the real dollars the World War II veteran received. Those 1972 increases were the first in the seven year history of today's GI Bill that the veteran has come close to equality by the limited measure of the Consumer Price Index.

Although changes in the Consumer Price Index are used by the Veterans Administration to defend the adequacy of present veterans benefits, if taken as a major indicator, they fall far short of giving a valid economic profile. For example, if Congress had used the CPI as the test of what today's minimum wage ought to be, it would have recently voted to raise the $.40 hourly rate of 1948 to $.81 per hour this fall. In actuality, the figure was raised to $1.60 in 1967 and Congress voted a $2.20 rate recently.

Subsistence Payments Compared to Average Monthly Earnings.—More importantly, however, today's veteran has far less a share of average monthly earnings after payment of his tuition. In fact, there can be no comparison between the World War II veteran and today's veteran, when his average income after paying tuition is related to average U.S. monthly earnings. This is particularly true for married veterans. The World War II veteran's $75 a month subsistence benefit was usually free of any tuition payments (because most tuition was covered by the up to $500 direct grant from the Veterans Administration, and higher-priced schools' charges could be covered by the accelerated payments provisions), so the veteran could devote all of his money to the cost of living.

A chart contained in the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee Report on the 1972 bill, prepared by the Library of Congress, as updated, shows that today's veteran has a comparable share of average monthly earnings to the 35% the World War II vet had—*but only before he pays tuition.* A chart we have prepared shows that after the vet pays tuition, his funds left for subsistence drop from 35.7% to 26.4% of average U.S. monthly earnings—$57 less per month than he would receive in order to have 35% of average monthly earnings on which to live. Even worse off is the veteran paying tuition at four-year public colleges in major states, who nets only 22.4% of average monthly earnings, and who would need another $82

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

per month to equal the World War II veteran's GI bill subsistence benefits of 35% of average monthly earnings.

Married Veterans' Subsistence is Far Below World War II Veterans'.—Although the draftsmen of the GI bills never intended them to provide a full scholarship, it is hard to contemplate that Congress knowingly put today's married veteran attempting to obtain a four-year college education as far away as he is from comparability with the World War II vet. The married veteran with two dependents must earn $153 a month over and above his GI Bill payments simply to be at the starting place the World War II married veteran was. A difficult feat when veterans are faced with the high unemployment rates of 1970 to 1973.

The Job Market and the Veteran.—The higher prevailing unemployment rates for veterans and the difficult employment situation of the past three years, when compared with the full employment economy that soon followed World War II, mean that today's veteran has a much more difficult time in making up the short fall between his GI Bill benefits and a reasonable share of average monthly earnings, on which to support himself and, if he has one, his family. According to the Harris Survey, commissioned by the Veterans Administration, veterans unemployment reached a level of 15%, with 21% of black veterans unemployed, and 19% of veterans with less than a high school education unemployed. Younger veterans aged 20-24 still continue to suffer from high unemployment rates, and find part time jobs particularly hard to come by.

The GI Bill and Tuition at Public Colleges.—The individual veteran at a major public university—such as Pennsylvania State University—actually had fewer subsistence dollars to attend college—until the October 1972 increase—than the World War II veteran. But, in the meantime, the cost of living had soared. In real terms, these dollars had a lesser purchasing power than the World War II benefits of $75 a month. This continues to be the case in several of the states with high tuition charges.

Geography and GI Bill Use.—The dollar deficiencies in take-home GI Bill benefits are reflected in the low rates of GI Bill use for college and junior college in Ohio and Pennsylvania, where public colleges' tuition rates are relatively high, which have 16.1% and 16.2% rates, respectively, in comparison with California, with its 35.7% rate; Florida, with its 25.4% rate; and Texas, with its 24.3% rate—among the states with high veteran populations. The average dollar payment per veteran reflects these state differences in participation rates.

Veterans Ruled Out of Private Colleges.—The World War II veterans could go to private, as well as public, colleges, but the average level of tuition (around $1000, which is five times that prevailing after World War II at private colleges), rules most veterans out of attendance, since their GI Bill benefits total only $1080. Not only does this exclude the veteran from the well-known high prestige colleges, but also it takes them out of the lesser-known private colleges, which are frequently located in the Eastern and Midwestern states, and which offer the kinds of courses and educational settings that might be most congenial to the veteran. Furthermore, these colleges are the ones that are today looking for students, and might exert those extra efforts on behalf of the veteran which he would need to overcome prior educational deficiencies.

Increased Federal Support for Veterans Education.—After World War II, the educational community in general, particularly the public colleges, were encouraged to admit GI's because their costs would be largely covered directly by the federal government, out of state tuition rates, paid for in-state veterans by the government, enabled colleges, to expand their enrollments. Instead of the federal government's paying out-of-state tuition fees directly, today's veteran himself pays the tuition rate. No longer does the GI Bill cover out-of-state tuition rates for in-state veterans. As a result, colleges lack the funds to treat the veteran in any other way than they would a normal student. They have been unable to expand, in a time of low growth in state appropriations for four year college education. The differences between in-state and out-of-state tuition rates are as much as $1,500 a year. Because until the first distribution, of $25,000,000 in Veterans Cost of Instruction monies on June 30, no money other than a $4.00 processing fee went to colleges for enrolling veterans, no structure was built up to assist them. In contrast, the business of colleges after World War II was educating veterans, and their administrative services and physical plant were tailored to the veteran.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Exhibit IV

APPENDIX A. TUITION RATES AT PUBLIC COLLEGES, 1973–74

TABLE A.—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973–74 ACADEMIC YEAR. (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972–73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESES)

	Undergraduate tuition and/or required fees	
	Resident	Nonresident
ALABAMA		
Alabama A&M University	$765($270)	$1,635($570)
Auburn University	525(435)	1,050(900)
University of Alabama	510	1,020
Auburn (Main Campus)	495(315)	1,035(705)
Florence State University	435(405)	870(810)
Jacksonville University	435(435)	810(810)
University of Alabama—Huntsville	525	1,050
University of Montevallo	450	870
University of South Alabama	573	867
ALASKA		
University of Alaska	472(402)	1,072(1,002)
ARIZONA		
Arizona State University	330	1,710
University of Arizona	411	1,305
Northern Arizona University	330(304)	990(963)
ARKANSAS		
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville	450	900
University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff	405	1,095
Arkansas Polytechnic College	470	940
Arkansas State University	405	750
Henderson State College	409	850
Southern State College	410	670
State College of Arkansas	410	570
CALIFORNIA		
University of California System	648	2,148
California Maritime Academy	1,380(1,080)	1,680(1,380)
California State Polytechnic University		
Pomona	183	1,356
San Luis Obispo	165	1,305(1,185)
California State College		
Bakersfield	79	1,359
Dominguez Hills	148(144)	1,258(1,254)
San Bernardino	157	1,278
Stanislaus	140	1,385(1,256)
California State College		
Chico	166(160)	1,276(1,270)
Fresno	168	1,278
Fullerton	160	1,278
Hayward	163	1,395(1,273)
Long Beach	164	1,260(1,274)
Los Angeles	166	1,236(1,169)
Northridge	164	1,165
Sacramento	169	1,110
San Diego	167	719
San Fernando	164	1,11
COLORADO		
Colorado State University	778(570)	2,009(1,758)
University of Colorado, Boulder	501(576)	1,998(1,893)
Adams State College	471(474)	1,446(1,431)
Fort Lewis College	435(319)	1,317(1,203)
Metropolitan State College	339(333)	1,668(1,662)
Southern Colorado State College	474(474)	1,479(1,389)
University of Northern Colorado	477(477)	1,401(1,260)
Western State College of Colorado	258(249)	1,053(1,215)
CONNECTICUT		
University of Connecticut	715(655)	1,715(1,[illegible])
Central Connecticut State College	570	1,410
Southern Connecticut State College	574	1,434
Western Connecticut State College	450	1,200
DELAWARE		
Delaware State College	356(335)	920(870)
University of Delaware	585(475)	1,560(1,350)
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
District of Columbia Teachers College	70	1,087
Federal City College	132	852

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A. Tuition Rates at Public Colleges, 1973-74—Continued

TABLE A—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973-74 ACADEMIC YEAR (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972-73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESES)—Con.

	Undergraduate tuition and/or required fees	
	Resident	Nonresident
FLORIDA		
Florida A & M University	570	1,620
Florida State University	570	1,620
University of Florida	570	1,620
Florida Atlantic University	570	1,620
Florida Technological University	570	1,620
University of North Florida	570	1,620
University of South Florida	570	1,620
University of West Florida	570	1,620
GEORGIA		
Fort Valley State College	387(382)	927(922)
Georgia Institute of Technology	534	1,419
University of Georgia	539(519)	1,259(1,239)
Albany State College	435	975
Armstrong State College	405(390)	945(930)
Augusta College	400(380)	940(920)
Columbus College	375	936
Georgia College	423	963
Georgia Southern College	367(361)	787(781)
Valdosta State College	429(417)	969(957)
West Georgia College	417	957
HAWAII		
University of Hawaii	273(253)	733(743)
IDAHO		
University of Idaho	380(356)	1,280(1,156)
Boise State College	356	1,256
Idaho State University	276(373)	1,176(1,173)
Lewis-Clark State College	240	340
ILLINOIS		
Southern Illinois University	579	1,437
University of Illinois, Chicago Circle	636	1,626
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	666	1,676
Eastern Illinois University	599(691)	1,445(1,437)
Governors State University	565	1,650
Illinois State University	611(808)	1,272(1,240)
Northeastern Illinois University	476(500)	1,327(1,366)
Northern Illinois University	603(571)	647(611)
Sangamon State University	472(447)	1,133(1,110)
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville	569(564)	1,447(1,442)
Western Illinois University	561(568)	1,497(1,494)
INDIANA		
Indiana University	682(650)	1,560(1,490)
Purdue University	700	1,600
Ball State University	600	1,260
Indiana State University	660(600)	1,260(1,110)
IOWA		
Iowa State University	600	1,332(1,230)
University of Iowa	620	1,350(1,250)
University of Northern Iowa	600	1,100(1,000)
KANSAS		
Kansas State University	596(746)	1,316(1,066)
University of Kansas	548(496)	1,834(1,076)
Fort Hays Kansas State College	475(467)	970(892)
Kansas State College of Pittsburg	390	885(780)
Kansas State Teachers College	394(386)	889(781)
Wichita State University	536(459)	1,327(1,060)
KENTUCKY		
Kentucky State University	455(395)	985(911)
University of Kentucky	480(405)	1,210(1,120)
Eastern Kentucky University	420(360)	960(870)
Morehead State University	420(380)	960(836)
Murray State University	420(365)	960(881)
Northern Kentucky State College	420(360)	960(870)
Western Kentucky University	420(360)	960(870)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A. Tuition Rates at Public Colleges, 1973-74—Continued

TABLE A.—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973-74 ACADEMIC YEAR. (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972-73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESES)—Con.

	Undergraduate tuition and/or	
	Resident	Nonresident
LOUISIANA		
Louisiana State University	320	950
Southern University	284	914
Grambling College	332	782
Louisiana Teachers University	334(318)	964(948)
McNeese State University	290(285)	530(525)
Nicholls State University	302	932
Northeast Louisiana University	292(270)	922(900)
Northwestern State University	302(294)	932(924)
Southeastern Louisiana University	165	480
MAINE		
Maine Maritime Academy	600	1,350(1,200)
University of Maine:		
Augusta	400	1,400
Farmington	400	1,400
Fort Kent	430	1,430
Machias	400	1,300
Presque Isle	400	1,400
MARYLAND		
University of Maryland, College Park	698(639)	1,698(1,439)
University of Maryland, Eastern Shore	345(320)	695(620)
Bowie State College	570(450)	1,020(655)
Coppin State College	520(335)	970(685)
Frostburg State College	636(420)	1,036(770)
Morgan State College	651(460)	1,051(835)
St. Mary's College of Md	470(460)	720(710)
Salisbury State College	721	1,179(954)
Towson State College	546(436)	996(886)
University of Maryland, Baltimore Cty	560(500)	1,560(1,300)
MASSACHUSETTS		
University of Massachusetts	520(469)	1,320(1,069)
Boston State College	369(318)	669
Fitchburg State College	300(250)	600
Framingham State College	300(250)	600
Massachusetts College of Art	405(353)	705(703)
North Adams State College	357(307)	652
Salem State College	400(350)	800(700)
Southeastern Massachusetts University	420(370)	700(650)
Westfield State College	300(250)	600
Worcester State College	395(345)	695(645)
MICHIGAN		
Michigan State University	720(675)	1,620(1,530)
University of Michigan:		
Freshman-sophomore	800(699)	2,600(2,260)
Junior-senior	904(696)	2,800(2,260)
Wayne State University	704(668)	1,893(1,857)
Central Michigan University	550(510)	1,240(1,110)
Eastern Michigan University	565	1,353
Grand Valley State College	517(480)	1,305(1,224)
Northern Michigan University	495	1,260
Oakland University	602(557)	1,562(1,502)
Saginaw Valley College	510(450)	1,290(1,200)
Western Michigan University	540	1,140
MINNESOTA		
University of Minnesota	592(550)	1,522(1,456)
Bemidji State College	453(416)	827(788)
Mankato State College	333(307)	580(555)
Moorhead State College	333(307)	508(555)
St. Cloud State College	330(308)	578(555)
Southwest Minnesota State College	453(416)	824(787)
Winona State College	477(438)	873(834)
MISSISSIPPI		
Alcorn A&M College	400	1,000
Mississippi State University	506	1,106
University of Mississippi	516	1,116
Alcorn A & M College	400	1,000
Delta State College	434(428)	1,034(1,028)
Mississippi State College for Women	474(465)	1,074(1,965)
Mississippi Valley State College	400	1,000
University of Southern Mississippi	320	920

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A. TUITION RATES AT PUBLIC COLLEGES, 1973–74—Continued

TABLE A.—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973–74 ACADEMIC YEAR. (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972–73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESES)—Con.

	Undergraduate tuition and/or	
	Resident	Nonresident
MISSOURI		
Lincoln University	370(350)	640(020)
University of Missouri	(540)	1,540
Central Missouri State University	315(300)	915(900)
Harris Teachers College	205	NA
Missouri Southern State College	300	710
Missouri Western State College	340	720
Northeast Missouri State University	780	760
Northwest Missouri State University	310(300)	600(800)
Southwest Missouri State University	300	900
MONTANA		
Montana State University	476(471)	1,376(1,318)
University of Montana	337(471)	1,387(1,318)
Eastern Montana College	450(445)	1,350(1,292)
Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology	378(375)	1,278(1,223)
Northern Montana College	430(413)	1,330(1,260)
Western Montana College	434(432)	1,334(1,280)
NEBRASKA		
University of Nebraska	484	1,210
Kearney State College	505(403)	865(711)
University of Nebraska at Omaha	600(492)	1,508(1,218)
Wayne State College	555(443)	915(751)
NEVADA		
University of Nevada	519	1,719
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
University of New Hampshire	983(1,033)	2,233
Keene State College	617	1,450
Plymouth State College of the University of New Hampshire	714	1,574
NEW JERSEY		
Rutgers University	725	1,310
College of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey:		
New Jersey Dental School	1,188	1,838
New Jersey Medical School	1,135(1,125)	1,775
Rutgers Medical School	1,200(1,250)	1,850(1,900)
Graduate School of Biomedical Science	635	805
Glassboro State College	535	1,070
Jersey City State College	636	1,171
Montclair State College	679	1,333
Newark College of Engineering	632	1,216
Ramapo College of New Jersey	674	1,209
Stockton State College	666	1,201
Trenton State College	640	1,175
NEW MEXICO		
New Mexico State University	466	1,296
University of New Mexico	456	1,284
Western New Mexico University	333	900
NEW YORK		
City University of New York	70	620
Cornell University (statutory)	1,350(1,200)	1,950(1,800)
State University of New York:		
Freshman-Sophmore	740(740)	1,175(1,165)
Junior-Senior	900(890)	1,400(1,390)
Queens College of City University of New York	138	1,338(1,038)
State University of New York:		
Empire State College	900(786)	1,468(1,234)
Maritime College	800[600]	1,300[900]
State University of New York Colleges:		
Brockport	890[740]	1,390[1,165]
Buffalo	887[737]	1,387[1,162]
Fredonia	800[650]	1,300[1,075]
Geneseo	800[650]	1,300[1,075]
New Paltz	375[725]	1,375[1,150]
Old Westbury	800[650]	1,300[1,075]
Oneonta	800[650]	1,300[1,075]
Oswego	800[650]	1,300[1,075]
Plattsburgh	800[650]	1,300[1,075]
Potsdam	895[885]	1,395[1,385]
	[745(735)]	[1,170(1,160)]
Purchase	650	1,075
Utica-Rome	900	1,300

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A. TUITION RATES AT PUBLIC COLLEGES, 1973-74—Continued

TABLE A.—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973-74 ACADEMIC YEAR. (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972-73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESES)—Con.

	Undergraduate tuition and/or	
	Resident	Nonresident
NORTH CAROLINA		
North Carolina A&T University	542(525)	2,075(2,074)
North Carolina State University	474(427)	2,304(2,002)
University of North Carolina	439(422)	1,997
Appalachian State University	485(467)	2,070(2,067)
East Carolina University	438(423)	2,004
North Carolina Central University	443(421)	2,043(2,021)
Pembroke State University	389(390)	1,730
University of North Carolina at Wilmington	368(396)	1,923(1,936)
Western Carolina University	169(166)	691(699)
Winston-Salem State University	490(472)	1,875(1,872)
NORTH DAKOTA		
North Dakota State University	435	1,164
University of North Dakota	456	1,184
Dickinson State College	415(406)	952(943)
Mayville State College	305	852
Minot State College	400	937
Valley City State College	405(396)	942(933)
OHIO		
Kent State University	804	2,004
Miami University	780	1,980
Ohio State University	750	1,800
Bowling Green State University	780	1,179(1,143)
Central State University	663(648)	1,188(1,173)
University of Akron	704	1,605
University of Toledo	780	1,935
Wright State University	780(750)	1,630(1,650)
Youngstown State University	630(570)	1,200(1,050)
OKLAHOMA		
Langston University	337	832
Oklahoma State University	456	1,236
University of Oklahoma	448	1,200
Central State University	340	835
East Central State College	348	843
Northeastern State College	352(345)	847(840)
Northwestern State College	332(327)	827(822)
Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts	335	830
Southeastern State College	355	835
Southwestern State College	330	825
OREGON		
Oregon State University	451(425)	1,633(1,481)
University of Oregon	566(534)	1,748(1,593)
Eastern Oregon State College	549(519)	1,392(1,239)
Southern Oregon College	549(513)	1,392(1,233)
PENNSYLVANIA		
Pennsylvania State University	900(885)	2,100(1,986)
Temple University	1,050(970)	1,950(1,870)
University of Pittsburgh	1,017(982)	2,007(1,972)
Bloomsburg State College	750(700)	1,500(1,400)
California State College	820(770)	1,570(1,470)
Cheyney State College	415(780)	1,576(1,470)
Clarion State College	750(700)	1,380
East Stroudsburg State College	840(790)	1,470
Edinboro State College	750(700)	1,380
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	750(700)	1,500(1,400)
Kutztown State College	750(700)	1,380
Lincoln University	1,018(1,418)	1,718(1,418)
Lockhaven State College	750(700)	1,380
Mansfield State College	NA(760)	NA(1,450)
Millersville State College	750(700)	1,500(1,360)
Shippery Rock State College	750(700)	1,500(1,380)
RHODE ISLAND		
University of Rhode Island	761	1,661
Rhode Island College	490	1,175
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Clemson University	640	1,340
South Carolina State College	480	960
University of South Carolina	570	1,250
Francis Marion College	410	910
Winthrop College	560(470)	1,220(1,130)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A. TUITION RATES AT PUBLIC COLLEGES, 1973–74—Continued

TABLE A.—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973-74 ACADEMIC YEAR. (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972-73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESES)—Con.

	Undergraduate tuition and fees	
	Resident	Nonresident
SOUTH DAKOTA		
South Dakota State University	506(510)	1,337(1,132)
University of South Dakota	554(500)	1,259(1,076)
Black Hills State College	525(455)	1,038(873)
Dakota State College	550(488)	1,017(836)
Northern State College	397(345)	390(765)
University of South Dakota at Springfield	492(436)	1,024(896)
TENNESSEE		
Tennessee State University	351	1,161(1,071)
Austin Peay State University	318	1,128(1,038)
East Tennessee State University	378	1,188(1,113)
Memphis State University	348	1,064(948)
Middle Tennessee State University	358	1,168(1,078)
University of Tennessee:		
Chattanooga	461(396)	1,226(1,116)
Martin	414(390)	1,224(1,110)
TEXAS		
Prairie View A&M University	198	1,422
Texas A&M University	288(279)	1,368(1,359)
Texas Southern University	346(284)	1,422(1,364)
Texas Technical University	292(280)	1,444(1,442)
University of Houston	266(256)	1,346(1,336)
University of Texas, Austin	378(267)	1,458(1,347)
Angelo State University	300(280)	1,380(1,360)
East Texas State University	322(250)	1,402(1,330)
Midwestern University	210	1,200
North Texas State University	170(152)	710(692)
Sam Houston State University	276	1,356
Southwest Texas State University	270(218)	1,350(1,298)
Stephen F. Austin State University	280	1,360
Texas A&I University, Kingsville	270(190)	1,350(1,270)
West Texas State University	280	1,360
UTAH		
University of Utah	480	1,155
Utah State University	453(438)	963(948)
Weber State College	405	810
VERMONT		
University of Vermont	1,088(1,086)	2,688(2,536)
Castleton State College	720	1,850
Johnson State College	720	1,850
Lyndon State College	720	1,850
VIRGINIA		
University of Virginia	622(597)	1,447(1,372)
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	627	1,227
Virginia State College	690	1,150(950)
George Mason College	690(640)	1,410(1,360)
Longwood College	585(500)	935(850)
Madison College	652(647)	1,077(1,072)
Mary Washington College	792(762)	1,547(1,517)
Old Dominion University	470	870
Radford College	480(382)	879(861)
Virginia Commonwealth University	590(540)	1,190(1,080)
WASHINGTON		
University of Washington	564	1,581
Washington State University	564	1,581
Central Washington State College	495	1,359
East Washington State College	495	1,359
Evergreen State College	495	1,359
West Washington State College	495	1,359
WEST VIRGINIA		
West Virginia University	310	1,140
Bluefield State College	242(240)	992(990)
Concord College	240	990
Fairmont State College	242(232)	992(982)
Marshall University	282	1,082
Shepherd College	280	1,030
West Liberty State College	270(250)	1,020(1,000)
West Virginia Institute of Technology	277(260)	1,027(1,010)
West Virginia State College	250	1,000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A. TUITION RATES AT PUBLIC COLLEGES, 1973–74—Continued

TABLE A.—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973-74 ACADEMIC YEAR. (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972-73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESES)—Con.

	Undergraduate tuition and/or	
	Resident	Nonresident
WISCONSIN		
University of Wisconsin—Madison:		
Freshman-sophomore	573(558)	1,906
Junior-senior	628(558)	2,006(1,906)
University of Wisconsin:		
Eau Claire	604(528)	1,836(1,673)
La Crosse	611(535)	1,853(1,680)
Oshkosh	602(526)	1,844(1,671)
Platteville	620(544)	1,862(1,680)
River Falls	627(537)	1,869(1,680)
Stevens Point	519(518)	1,717(1,663)
Stout	604(528)	1,836(1,673)
Superior	610(534)	1,852(1,679)
Whitewater	607(531)	1,849(1,676)
WYOMING		
University of Wyoming	411	1,377

Sources: National Association of State Universities and Land-grant Colleges and American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

COST DATA

The amendment proposes to raise GI Bill benefits by paying, in addition to the current $220 per month, tuition costs up to $1,000 for those veterans enrolled in schools with a tuition rate above $419. The $419 figure represents the average tuition charge for two and four-year public colleges in the U.S., the level at which the Vietnam veteran has parity with benefits available to the WW II veteran, according to the V.A.

The estimated cost of paying up to $600 additional tuition for vets paying above $419 is $180 million in the first year. Built into this cost estimate is the possibility that some veterans currently enrolled in two-year community colleges would change to enrollment in four-year public colleges if they could afford it. Based on the V.A. calculation that 60% of the 700,000 veterans now enrolled in full or part-time colleges pay tuition rates below $419, 40% or 300,000 veterans would qualify for this amendment in the first year. Since under the amendment it would cost $60 million per every 100,000 veterans if the full $600 were paid to each, the $180 million estimate is on the high side.

There seems little basis for the argument that if this additional tuition was made available, there would be a rush to attend more expensive schools. For example, average U.S. private college tuition is $1900, putting the private institution still out-of-reach for most veterans, since they would have to produce an additional $900 on the average beyond full GI Bill benefits. Tuition at elite schools like Harvard, Princeton and Yale exceed $3,000 per year.

Some of the men using the GI Bill are, no doubt, attending inexpensive colleges, both two and four-year, for financial reasons alone. Those men deserve an opportunity to attend the school which is the best for their career choices, just as the WW II veteran could. This provision is particularly important to give vets in different states an equal chance at higher education. Statistics show, also, that there is very little difference in the type of institution of higher learning chosen by veterans and non-veterans, either geographically or financially.

Cost figures.—300,000 veterans at $600 = $180,000,000 assumes maximum use or large overflow of students in junior colleges into more expensive four-year colleges. There is little likelihood that this amendment could cost more than $100 million in the first year.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take this opportunity to congratulate our colleague, Mr. Walsh, for the leadership he has taken in this effort.

It certainly seems to me that we have a grave responsibility on this committee to redress the grievances of the Vietnam veterans and to

underline the fact that this is a bipartisan effort. This is not one that is politically motivated by any means.

The fact that you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Walsh and Mrs. Heckler and I have worked together with support from both sides of the aisle I think is significant to evidence the fact that we don't consider this to be a political ploy that is used many times to achieve a result for individuals in Congress.

This is a sincere effort in order to attempt to make up for the deficiencies that exist.

I notice, Mr. Walsh, you did make reference to the comparison of the price tag that the Veterans' Administration put on the bill and the money we are giving in South Vietnam.

I would like to put another figure in the record.

Just recently, our Government, through our Ambassador to India, gave to the Indian Government $2.2 billion. They wrote off $2.2 billion. That is double the amount that is asked for 5 years in this bill. I think it is about time that we as Americans started to take care of our own. I think this is certainly one way that we can attempt to do this.

The other point I would like to make is the question of abuses.

It is strange that we can trust a man to go out with a weapon, a highly sophisticated weapon, we can trust a man to guard the lives of his comrades and fellows-in-arms, but we can't trust him to take care of the money that we would give him. It is a strange anomaly.

Also, we have to consider the fact that in this question of peace with honor, that we do have a peace today, perhaps it is a fragile peace, but it is a peace, it is about time we honor our commitment to the men who have given everything that they had in Vietnam.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALSH. Thank you, Mr. Wolff.

I am certainly glad you emphasized the bipartisan nature of the support. I attempted to cover that in the opening part of my statement. In fact, that is what makes serving on the Veterans' Affairs Committee such a joy because I think since I have been on it it has been completely nonpartisan.

I am delighted to be a member of a committee that looks so objectively at all the things that this country needs.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Edwards, do you have any questions?

Mr. EDWARDS. No questions, but I wish to thank my colleague for an excellent statement.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Danielson.

Mr. DANIELSON. I am familiar with the bill. I am coauthor of one version. I am pleased to be able to join my colleague.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you, Mr. Walsh, for your appearance this morning and giving us an indepth analysis of the legislation before us.

At this point in the record, I wish to insert a statement from another colleague on our subcommittee, Joseph J. Maraziti, who could not be here this morning; also a statement of Congressman James T. Broyhill, I wish to insert it at this point in the record, without objection.

[The statements referred to follow:]

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH J. MARAZITI, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of this Subcommittee I am pleased to be able to speak to you in behalf of this veteran's tuition supplement legislation before you today which I have co-sponsored, H.R. 13185.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

You all know that I feel today's veterans are at a disadvantage when compared to the benefits their counterparts in World War II received. After World War II, veterans comprised fifty percent of all the enrollees in college. Today they are only 9 percent of the student population.

Fewer eligible vets are utilizing their G.I. bill benefits because of the disparity of tuition costs from institution to institution, and the high cost of living. In many areas a single vet can barely cover rent and food on his $220 a month, let alone cope with tuition, books and fees. That is assuming, of course, that the vet's benefit check arrives in time for registration.

A good example of this regional disparity of tuition costs between states can be made by comparing my home state of New Jersey with California, where many low cost public institutions of higher learning abound.

New Jersey is famous for its ivy league private colleges, but low cost public institutions are at a premium. Tuition at Jersey City State is $635. By comparison, there are many schools in California like California State which charge only $117 for tuition. This leaves veterans attending schools with tuitions comparable to Jersey City State $500 per school year less to live on than many of their California counterparts. This is certainly not equity!

My bill is designed to help correct this situation. It would allow the V.A. to pay up to $600 in direct tuition benefits to a veteran attending institutions where tuition exceeds $419. In other words, the V.A. would pay the vet the difference between the $419 and the actual tuition cost up to a maximum of $600. No tuition supplement payment would exceed $600.

The figure of $419 was selected because studies show the average cost of tuition across the nation in public institutions is $419 for the school year. Yet, forty percent of all vets attending school on the G.I. bill pay more than this amount in tuition. This leaves them less than $1,500 for living expenses.

The tuition supplement I propose would go a long way toward enabling New Jersey vets and their counterparts in other states to utilize the G.I. bill benefits they so richly deserve.

Today's vets don't have it easy. They face high prices, tight job opportunities and a lack of available housing. Private colleges are all but out of reach for most vets. The married veteran is even harder pressed to make ends meet.

To bring some equity back into the G.I. bill, I respectfully urge this Subcommittee to report H.R. 13185 out for Full Committee action.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES T. BROYHILL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to address your Subcommittee on consideration of this important legislation to benefit those veterans who were injured or who suffer from injuries as a result of their service to our country. I am very pleased and the veterans of North Carolina and across this nation are very pleased that you have initiated these hearings on compensation and related legislation.

Compensation payments, in my opinion, must be increased if the purchasing power of the disabled veteran is to be maintained in response to the cost of living. I am a sponsor of H.R. 12981, which is identical to your bill, Mr. Chairman. It provides for a 15% increase in compensation benefits and in dependency allowances for veterans with service-connected disabilities rated 50% or more. In addition, the bill proposes to raise from $47 to $60 a month the special statutory awards payable to veterans who have suffered certain anatomical losses.

As we all know, inflation has skyrocketed in recent years. The cost of living has increased approximately 11% since the last increase in compensation which went into effect August 1, 1972. Accordingly, we owe our disabled veterans an increase in the monies they receive, and we must keep the compensation program in line with the increases in the cost of living.

For many of America's disabled war veterans, their dependents and survivors, compensation and DIC benefits are the only fixed monthly income. These individuals are hit the hardest by runaway inflation and are desperately struggling to survive. The high cost of food, clothing, housing, fuel, and other basic necessities makes it our duty to increase compensation benefits.

Statistics show there are approximately 2,200,000 veterans from all wars receiving compensation benefits. During Fiscal Year 1974, it is estimated that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

we will pay $3,172,800 in payments to these deserving veterans. H.R. 11469 and H.R. 12381 would require an additional $4250 million during the first year.

I want also to point out to the committee that there has been no raise in the statutory awards for the loss of limb or body organ since July 1, 1952. This award is $17 monthly. Such awards were established in 1933, eligible veterans received $25. In 1945, this amount was increased to $35 and in 1946 to $47. These deserving disabled veterans are long overdue for an increase in these statutory awards. 86,004 veterans would be affected at a first year cost of $13.3 million, a small amount in terms of today's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to advise you of my support for your legislation, H.R. 12390, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation to 15%. These benefits assist families of our service-connected deceased veterans. Therefore, as a grateful and understanding nation, we must increase the payments of the eligible survivors at this time of severe inflation.

The many veterans organizations and military groups who have appeared before the Subcommittee should be commended for their research on compensation and DIC legislation. The veterans of our country are most fortunate to have these dedicated groups working for their welfare. Some groups favor automatic cost-of-living increases in compensation and DIC while others oppose it. I have carefully reviewed the pending proposals and I am of the opinion that the periodic review of the Congress into compensation and DIC benefits is more beneficial than automatic cost-of-living increases. As one veterans' organization so adequately pointed out, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) has risen 220% since compensation benefits first began in 1933. The Congress has increased compensation benefits by 450%. If compensation had been tied to the rise in the cost of living, these deserving veterans, their widows, and dependents would have suffered a net loss of 230%.

Let me thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the Subcommittee for this opportunity to express my views on this important legislation. I am hopeful that you will take prompt action on these important matters to benefit the deserving veteran, his widow and dependents.

Mr. HEISTOSKI. The next witness is Mr. Melvin C. Eggers, Chancellor, Syracuse University.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, if I could I would like the privilege of presenting the chancellor to this committee. He has been the chancellor of Syracuse University now for a number of years, and came up through the ranks of professor of economics where he served for 20 years, and then succeeded to the chancellor's job.

I think that in his tenure as chancellor he has demonstrated one of the things that we try to achieve in every educational institution, and that is the fact that he has been able to bring town and gown very, very closely together in our community.

All of the citizens of the city of Syracuse share with me my high regard and esteem and fondness for the chancellor.

It is my privilege at this time to present to you chancellor Melvin Eggers of Syracuse University.

STATEMENT OF MELVIN C. EGGERS, CHANCELLOR SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Mr. EGGERS. Thank you, Mr. Walsh.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Melvin A. Eggers, chancellor of Syracuse University, a private, coeducational university in central New York's 33d Congressional District. I am pleased to have the opportunity to testify before the committee on the topic of veterans' benefits. My remarks will be very brief and personal. I come before you not with the assumption that I can give you information not available to you from other sources, but to give personal support to H.R. 11134 and to suggest that the presidents of other

private institutions and, indeed, public institutions as well, feel as I do about the importance and urgency of the legislation under consideration by this committee.

I support the principle that the educational benefits to veterans of Vietnam should be on a par with those of veterans of World War II. After 3 years of service in World War II, I took advantage of the GI bill to return to Yale University to complete my doctoral program. Most of my fellow students at that time were also veterans and we all felt very fortunate to be able to enroll in a private institution which offered the programs we sought. I would wish that the Vietnam veterans would have the same opportunity.

Others, I am sure, will press the point that total benefits available to veterans of Vietnam are insufficient and should be increased. They are clearly not as generous as those which we received after World War II. My comments, however, are limited to the proposal that those veterans who attend private colleges and universities should have an allowance for tuition. I, therefore, speak in direct support of H.R. 11134.

The most dramatic way in which the benefits for Vietnam veterans differ from the benefits for veterans of World War II is that they fail to make allowance for the difference between the cost of attending a public institution and a private institution. Taking into consideration changes in incomes and prices, the total allowance offered to Vietnam veterans is roughly comparable to the subsistence allowance for veterans of World War II. However, the benefits available to veterans of World War II included full tuition.

Those Vietnam veterans now attending an institution which charges little or no tuition are in a position not greatly different from the position of the veterans who attended similar institutions after World War II. The country is much wealthier now and for that and a number of other reasons the Government ought to do better.

But for those Vietnam veterans attending private institutions the absence of an allowance for tuition is critical. The striking fact is that the total allowance for the typical Vietnam veteran is less than the tuition at more private institutions. As a consequence, the value of benefits offered to Vietnam veterans attending private institutions is much less than the value of the benefits offered to World War II veterans who attended similar institutions.

For many veterans of Vietnam, as for the veterans of World War II, a private institution is a better and preferred choice I do not believe it is deliberate public policy to restrict the educational opportunities for Vietnam veterans to those offered by the public institutions.

It may not be possible to allow full tuition, as it was to the World War II veteran, though there is much to recommend of the World War II formula. Those students who attend private institutions expect to pay a premium for what they consider a preferred and more attractive program. Yet, when the premium becomes as much as the present differential between the tuition at public and private institutions, the effect is to bar many deserving students from the programs they want. To broaden the effective range of program choice some payment should be made to Vietnam veterans to meet tuition costs.

The tuition allowance proposed in H.R. 11134 is much less than I wish it were. In fact, it does little more than offset the increase in the

differential between the tuition at public and private institutions during the period many Vietnam veterans have been in school. Nevertheless, I support it as a step in the right direction.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you, Mr. Eggers, for taking the time to come here and testify on this very important legislation. We appreciate your comments and observations.

Mr. Edwards, do you have any questions?

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

How would it work out on a nationwide basis? Some States have done a very good job so far as higher education is concerned, such as my own State of California. They have gone to the taxpayers of the State and have provided public institutions of higher education on a Statewide basis with very low tuition. Some States have not done as well. We always have difficulty here in being sure that we are treating all the people of the country equally and being fair about it.

Do you see a problem there?

Mr. EGGERS. I don't consider it a problem. It is a fact that a larger portion of the cost of education of the veterans, also of other students, is borne by the State in most States than is true in the case of New York and Massachusetts, but it seems not unreasonable to me for the Federal Government to support those veterans who are in the States which do not have such extensive State systems a little more fully than it supports the students in those States which do have comprehensive State systems.

Mr. EDWARDS. It bothers me, and I would like to yield to my colleague, Mr. Danielson, who had a long and distinguished record in the State Legislature of California. California has worked very hard over many decades to take money from the citizens of California to provide low-cost higher eduction. We are not trying to be selfish about the accomplishments that our young people are enjoying, but some States don't have even a State income tax. Your State does not, Mr. Chairman, does it?

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Not yet.

Mr. WOLFF. I think it might be well to mention that the people of New York State are taxed the highest in the entire Nation, and the contributions that are made by the people of New York State—I am not trying to defend what we do in New York State, because on our side of the aisle we do not have responsibility what goes on in New York State, unfortunately. The fact is that New York has the highest tax rate of any State in the entire Nation, and in addition to that New York State makes the greatest contribution to the taxes of the Nation, the people of New York City to the taxes of the Nation, than any other State.

In addition to that, I would like to state I am not fully familiar with the figures but I think we can get them for the record, New York State contributed a greater number of veterans than any other State.

Mr. EDWARDS. I appreciate the observations of my colleague from New York. I watched a 2-hour program on TV the other night that dealt to a large extent with the problems of private higher education institutions in New York State and elsewhere. So many of them are not surviving, are not going to survive, and partially because of the competition of low cost, tax supported colleges and universities,

which is not to state we should not have them and support them, because they are the greatest thing in the world.

Mr. Eggers, you have a huge State college system, is that not correct?

Mr. Eggers. It is relatively new.

Mr. Edwards. Relatively new and very large.

Mr. Eggers. Very large. About half the students in New York State attend the public system and the other half attend private institutions in the State, because our system of higher education was established early in the history of the State and of the country, and provided a major portion of the education for a long time; whereas in many Western States the higher education was begun by the State rather than by private institutions. It is very difficult to start an institution because of the initial costs of doing so.

But I should hope that the method of financing veterans would not aggravate the problem of private institutions or contribute to their difficulties. Any kind of program which provides encouragement and indeed makes it much more economical, any Federal program which makes it more economical for students to attend State systems rather than a private system is one which aggravates the problem of the private system.

You know, to the extent the troubles of the private system increase, the cost to the State increases because they will then take over the students at full cost rather than provide modest cost for students to stay in the private system.

Mr. Edwards. I will yield now, Mr. Chairman, but I want to make very clear that I am very much in favor of the objective of these bills. I think the Vietnam veteran should be able to attend any college or university of the country as we veterans of World War II were allowed to do, and the good health of the country was improved immeasurably by the GI bill of rights after World War II.

We have gotten money back tenfold by a better way of life, and the taxes from these people, too. So, I don't know how we can work this out but I am certainly in favor of it.

Mr. Helstoski. I will just make an observation on your comments. The benefits don't necessarily inure only to the recipients of education in that State. We are no longer that provincial in the Nation to say that New Jersey provides an educational system for the New Jersey citizens alone. That is not true for our State colleges.

In New Jersey we have the highest real estate tax in the Nation. That supports the educational programs in New Jersey. We are ninth in the Nation in terms of per capita contribution to the Federal Government in taxation. So we are quite high in support of educational programs.

One other thing: We in the East have never been the recipients of land grant college programs. Most of the Western schools are based on this kind of philosophy. This goes way back to the establishment of educational systems in the West. That, in my judgment, has a distinct advantage for those Western States through the land-grant college programs.

I don't think we dispute the necessity of finding some kind of equal support to the veteran going to a school, wherever he might be in the Nation, whether a private institution which might afford a better

program for him, despite the fact that the State of California has community college and State university programs provided for the students.

At any rate, this is the problem that we have, and I am sure that we recognize the need for finding some kind of equal rights for our veterans in the differentials that exist between State public institutions and private institutions.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Chairman, I see no other way to get close to equalizing the opportunities for different programs, other than to some kind of financial allowance for tuition.

Mr. HELSOSKI. Such as provided in this bill.

Mr. EDGAR. Such as provided in this bill.

Mr. HELSOSKI. Mr. Danielson, do you have any questions?

Mr. DANIELSON. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, Mr. Edwards. I would like to point out that I support the bill. I am one of the authors of the bill. I have no objections to the bill and its purposes. In fact, I think it is commendable and I am enthusiastic in my support.

In this question as in many others there is more than one aspect to be considered. Somewhere along the line with this bill going through the Congress I think we are going to have to make some kind of provision that to the extent a school is able to be paid through the veteran or his tuition in whatever State, New Jersey, New York, what have you, the same amount should be paid in any other State. I have in mind particularly my State of California. It is going to cost a certain amount of money to educate these young people. To the extent the Federal Government through the Veterans' Administration pays part of that cost to New York, to New Jersey, to whatever other State, I feel they should buy the equivalent amount to the State of California.

We are not talking about difference in amount. The cost of living is one thing that the veteran gets. But to the extent that it doesn't come from the Veterans' Administration, which is federally collected taxes, it comes from the State collected taxes. The taxpayer in California I feel under the 14th amendment to the Constitution is entitled to the same consideration of this thing as the taxpayer in New York, Massachusetts, or New Jersey.

We have had in California for many years as a primary State policy the public education of our people. We have only with great reluctance imposed any required fees or any tuition. That has come about in recent years. If you will take a look at the chart which Mr. Walsh attached, in our California State universities the average tuition is $160 to $165. The State colleges run from $59 to $157. The University of California system is now up to $644. We didn't have anything until a few years ago.

I feel, and I will urge, that to the extent that we make these added funds available to veterans who attend private schools, the same dollar value should be made available to our State colleges and universities in other States so that dollarwise we come out even.

That, in my opinion, is fair and equitable and in fact it would be unfair and inequitable to do otherwise.

There are two other points I wish to make. The gentleman's comments permit an inference that he may have a different goal in mind than just education of veterans. At least it could be a background, namely, the preservation of the private education system.

I wish to make eminently clear that the function of this committee of Congress and the Veterans' Administration is to enable veterans to receive educational training. It is not to provide a financial crutch to the private educational system. To the extent that one incidentally creates the other, that is well and good. But it is not our function to do something which is aimed at helping finance a private educational system. It is our sole duty and responsibility and jurisdiction to try to help educate veterans. If that incidentally helps private education that is fine, I am all for it. But we must not mistake our goals here.

This committee does not even have jurisdiction over the subject of financing education. We have the jurisdiction over the subject of financing the education of veterans. If the bill had any other purpose it would go to another committee, the Committee on Education and Labor. It would not belong here at all.

Lastly, I wish to remind the gentleman, and I can understand his comment, since he is identified with Syracuse University, that this idea that the private school is the institution of first choice, could at least be distorted or based on lack of information.

I question that Syracuse University or Yale or Harvard or any other private university you wish to name, would exceed the excellence of the University of California or that any of these colleges exceed the excellence of educational opportunities or curriculum made available through our California State University system or State college system.

I would also like to add that we are not just talking about starting an education system 100 years ago, 150 years ago. In the last 12 years, to my personal knowledge, in California we have set up three new campuses, one at the University of California at Santa Cruz, one at Irvine, one in San Diego. We have had to acquire, at taxpayers expense, the campuses. We built the physical plant. We have staffed the faculty. We got the student body growing and each is calculating to take care of 25,000 students. That is no small feat in 12 years. We have expanded our State university and State college system proportionately. It is a heavy load on the taxpayer. We are glad to make it. We do not oppose some of those taxes and I have not gotten too much flak from the taxpayer.

I think this is an example that might well be emulated by the other States in the Union.

Mr. Eggers. Mr. Danielson, I understand that this committee is not set up primarily to finance private higher education. I might suggest, however, that the committee might wish to examine the impact of the way in which the veterans' benefits impact the different kinds of institutions in the country, how they would react to that, I obviously will leave to the committee. But if the way in which this particular program is financed has a negative impact upon one segment of higher education it seems to me that it would not be improper or unreasonable for the committee to take that into consideration.

With respect to the other point, a matter that I would hold to is that at least in the State of New York some of the private colleges and

universities have programs not as readily available in the State system. This is in part because there is an effort to work out a cooperative arrangement between the State and the private system so that the State would not duplicate the strength developed in the private institution.

Some of the veterans would choose programs that have been left to the private sector very largely. Although that is not true of all cases, it is true in some programs. So that in the State of New York, if a student chooses a particular area of study he would in fact find that particular area more fully developed at a private institution as opposed to a public institution at the present time. This is by no means to say that as a general rule that the private schools are better than the public schools.

I would not challenge for a moment the preeminence of the University of California but I would say in the State of New York there are programs at Syracuse University not available in the public sector.

Mr. DANIELSON. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I would hope that the public sector would realize the shortcomings of New York and make available the educational opportunities which its citizens deserve.

Again I want to point out I have no quarrel with this bill. I am one of the authors and I am supporting the bill right down the line. I just want to see to it that if the schools of New York get x dollars for educating the veterans, the schools of California should get x dollars for educating the veterans. Our goal is to provide the veterans with an educational opportunity. That is our jurisdiction, that is our desire, that really is our only legal function. I am all for it.

Now, to the extent private schools benefit, I am all for them, too. We also have some dandy private schools such as Stanford, the University of Southern California, Occidental, and a number of others. They will benefit also. I just want to keep ourselves in focus here. I think a sharp focus is great in considering a bill.

Mr. EGGERS. Thank you.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Wolff, do you have any questions of the witness?

Mr. WOLFF. I would like to make some observations based on my colleagues from California who have perhaps one of the best educational systems in the entire Nation.

I wish that there was as much attention paid to education in New York as you folks have given in California.

However, I think one aspect of it must be clearly understood. That is the fact that we can't consider the balkanization of our country in education and consider just the States involved. The veterans are involved.

In our public schools of higher education our City University of New York has, if you will just refer to the chart, a tuition of $870, certainly comparable to the situation that is proposed here.

One of the problems that we are going to face with this bill is a problem that has been articulated by our colleagues here, the question of which State gets more than the other out of this bill. I don't think any individual should be penalized. I think the educational opportunities should be open to all people whether they want to go to private schools or go to public schools.

I also want to say to my colleagues from California that you know we fund an awful lot of aircraft programs that go to California. We don't get very much in the way of benefit from those in New York. In a variety of fields we have perhaps inequities that exist in the way of Federal funding that goes to the various areas.

We found that true most recently in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, where New York was singled out as a target State to be penalized by the Congress generally. I think this is an unfortunate situation because it does not take into account the contributions that are made by the said States and the other types of activity for which a State should be compensated.

New York does not get too much in the way of farm subsidies. New York does not get too much in the way of Defense installations today. I don't know how many Defense installations we have left in the State of New York but they are very few.

I think we have to consider it today on an overall basis, we should all put it in the same pot, the taxes we pay are in support of the individual veteran who has served in the defense of this Nation. I hope that we don't get into the question of the States again and that we consider this purely on the basis of the individual veteran. The delineator for this should be the kids who are served.

Thank you.

Mr. Helstoski. I don't have any questions except to compliment Mr. Eggers. We want to thank you for your testimony, Mr. Eggers.

Mr. Wolff. I just have one more question.

There has been much in the newspapers of recent date about the Veterans' Administration not being too prompt with payments to the veterans. I wonder if you can give us any enlightenment as to what is happening to the veterans on your campus.

Mr. Eggers. I don't have specific evidence in support of that point of view, but there are with me this morning two of our former students who will be glad to testify from their personal experience.

Mr. Wolff. I would much prefer for this committee to look into this problem rather than having the Veterans Administration investigate as to whether or not they are fulfilling their obligations.

Mr. Walsh. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chancellor Eggers for the time he has devoted to coming down here. I would just like to enter a couple of facts in the record.

I don't know what the taxes are today, Mr. Wolff, but when I left the mayor's office in the City of Syracuse a few years ago New York State was getting back 22 cents for every dollar that it was sending to Washington. I don't think the figure has changed a great deal since that time.

I want to assure Mr. Danielson that there is no intention in this bill to benefit higher education. The real intent of the bill, of course, as we so well understand, is to equalize the benefit between the Vietnam veteran and his predecessor.

Mr. Danielson. On that I agree. I think the gentleman knows I agree wholeheartedly. I commend him for having introduced the first of this series of bills, all of which have the same objective. He is assured not only of my present support but my continued support of his objective.

Mr. Walsh. I might assure Mr. Danielson, that I will be happy to support payments to the State of California if he will support an

additional return to the State of New York from the money we send down here.

Mr. DANIELSON. I think what we are after here is providing the veterans who are entitled to educational benefits with adequate allowance for tuition so that they can go to the school of their choice. The veterans are the people to whom we owe an obligation. And I am for that 100 percent.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Our next scheduled witness is Mr. William Byrne.

Mr. WATSH. At this time I would like to present two of the students from Syracuse University, Mr. William Byrne, chairman of the legislative committee of the Syracuse University veterans' organization, and he is accompanied by Frank Lee, who is president of the Syracuse University Veterans' Organization.

Both of these gentlemen are substantially invoived in the creation of this veterans' organization and have been with it and active in it since its inception.

I want to thank both of these gentlemen for taking the time to come down and appear before this committee.

At this time I would like to present Mr. Byrne.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Byrne, if you don't mind, would you please allow Congressman Conte to present his statement at this time, inasmuch as he has another committee meeting which he must attend.

STATEMENT OF HON. SILVIO O. CONTE, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS, APPEARING IN BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES AND THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

Mr. CONTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have an appropriations hearing and Congressman McFall and I are the only two there. I want to thank you and other members of the committee for allowing me to go on.

You recall I was back here in September testifying for the increased assistance and also for increased tuition. At that time I stated I felt very strongly about this because I owed everything that I have to the GI bill of rights. Had it not been for the GI bill of rights I never would have received the education that I did. Most likely, I wouldn't be here in the U.S. Congress today.

I am here today to testify on the subject of the GI bill. Specifically, I have come to urge you to consider revisions which, I feel, must be made if that program of education and training is to represent both a positive contribution toward the Nation's system of manpower planning and a just measure of compensation toward those who served their country in a grim period of undeclared and unpopular war.

Like the Vietnam draft, the system of educational benefits provided for veterans today is profoundly unfair. The unfairness of the draft, you will recall, was that the burden of it fell most heavily on those without the family or financial resources to obtain the precious student deferments. This was changed by the Congress and the Nixon administration. The unfairness of the present GI bill lies in the fact that access to higher education has little to do with the service a veteran was asked to give and gave, but is determined rather by the State he lives in and the structure of higher education which that State has chosen over the course of many years.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This is another injustice which I hope the Congress will see fit to correct. I believe that a tuition equalizer, providing increased assistance of up to $6,000 per year to veterans facing greater tuition costs, is the best way to achieve this end.

To say that the present system is unfair does not mean that either its conception or execution to date have been flawed in any way by bad intentions. I would suggest only that, since the present GI bill first became effective in 1966, we have not had the knowledge necessary to understand its failings. Such knowledge is now available.

The full scope of the deficiencies in today's GI bill, deficiencies which I was, frankly, unaware of, were revealed recently by two studies. One of these was done under congressional mandate for the Veterans' Administration by the Educational Testing Service, and the other was prepared by the Special Veterans' Opportunity Committee, which I chaired, for the National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors. Because of these studies, we know now that there is a direct correlation between the cost of education available in any given region and the extent to which veterans make use of their benefits.

Thus, in California where there is a well developed system of colleges and junior colleges with tuition often as low as $160 a year, 37 percent of the Vietnam-era veterans make use of their benefits to attend 4-year colleges and junior colleges. In Vermont, however, the situation is quite different. Tuition at the University of Vermont is $1,088 a year, and at other State colleges it begins at $720 a year. Accordingly, the utilization rate of GI bill benefits among Vermont veterans is only 14.2 percent, the lowest in the country.

To compare the price of various State institutions is to mislead with too little information. Of equal importance is the availability of public institutions of higher learning, and this varies widely across the country, though the patterns are discernible.

In the East and Midwest, a significant portion of the institutions of higher learning are private, and their costs are usually higher than even the highest priced State colleges and universities. As a result and in sharp contrast to the 37 percent utilization rate of California, nowhere in the East is the utilization of educational benefits for college and junior college among Vietnam-era veterans greater than 25 percent.

Certainly there is no reason to assume any difference between the desires and aspirations of those veterans who live in the East and those of California, and equally certainly there were no differences in the hardships and dangers they were made to suffer during their tours of duty. The distinctions between Yankees, Southerners, Westerners, and the sons of the Farm Belt are not ones that the Viet Cong and the NVA bothered to make. If in the face of our present knowledge we continue to allow the system of benefits we have designed and control to make these distinctions, we will be committing a grievous wrong.

Yet the tuition equalizer that could correct this wrong has been opposed by the Veterans' Administration. In his testimony last Friday before the Senate Subcommittee on Readjustment, Education and Employment of the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee, Odell W. Vaughn, the VA's Chief Benefits Director, said he was unalterably opposed to such a system, even though the payment would be made to the veteran instead of the school.

During the same presentation he argued that GI bill benefits had, during the past 4 years, increased by some 70 percent; that the present GI bill provided more opportunity for more veterans than did either the World War II or Korean bill; and that to adopt the kind of change I am advocating would cause unwarranted difficulty in administration and unnecessary waste in the overall disbursement of GI bill education benefits. It is difficult to agree with these assertions.

I have concerned myself so far with the inequities within the present system. That is wrong. It is not altogether a good system, and so to say that it is 70 percent better than it was 4 years ago, as Mr. Vaughn did, is to say only that a flawed program is now slightly less flawed. He is right, however, to call our attention to the GI bill initiated after World War II.

Under that program, the veteran's tuition, books, and other academic costs were paid by the Government directly to the colleges and the veteran himself was given a living allowance of $75 a month. At the time that was equal to 35.4 percent of an average American's monthly earnings. The same fraction of average monthly earnings is paid to today's single veteran in the form of a monthly check, often late, made out for $220. The World War II veteran had only to keep himself alive with his check, and he frequently had access to Government-subsidized housing. Today's veteran is asked not only to live on this sum but to pay the entire cost of his education with it. As a rule, it simply cannot be done. So in all too many cases where the veteran is not able to supplement this meager income it is meaningless to him. This would not be so were a tuition equalization provision built into the GI bill.

Before the committee arrives at any conclusion, it will, no doubt, ask itself how much weight should be attached to the kinds of problems discussed by Mr. Vaughn, tho based his objections mainly on negative aspects of the post World War II experience, the payment to certain colleges of out-of-State tuition rates for in-State students. It is difficult to see why this should concern the Veterans' Administration since there is no proposal under consideration to abandon direct payment to the veterans and therefore little possibility, much less danger, of that phenomenon recurring.

It was the Bradley Commission and the House Select Committee to Investigate Educational Programs under the GI bill, the latter headed by the former chairman of this committee, Congressman Olin Teague, which published reports of these kinds of abuses of public funds, abuses in the sense that what was involved was a back-door method of providing Federal aid to higher education. But these groups were not blind to the value of the work accomplished by the expenditures they were examining. The report of Congressman Teague's committee issued in February of 1952 said, "Considered as a whole, there is little question that better training was achieved at the college level for less money than in any other phase of the program." The Bradley Commission opined similarly.

To delineate the facts of unequal treatment for equal service which discouragingly afflict the lives of so many veterans and to show that the opportunity given to the veterans of Vietnam is not at all comparable to that powerful stepping stone of education that changed the lives of so many World War II veterans—and I include myself—is to make a strong case for change and a tuition equalizer on the basis of simple justice alone. It does not, however, fully describe the kinds of

problems the present system has caused and will continue to cause if action is not taken soon. This is because the disparities which exist discriminate not only against individuals but against States and entire regions of the country.

I have already mentioned the kinds of advantages which accrue to California veterans because their State has a system of colleges and junior colleges financed through direct taxation. We should not overlook the advantages that accrue to the State itself. Between fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1973, $1,280,000,000 in Federal scholarship money was paid to veterans in California. In the same period, the State of New York received only $460 million in GX bill benefits. So California received three times as much money for its veterans as New York did though it has only half again as many of them.

It is right that States which utilize private financing and tax credits rather than direct taxation to support their colleges should be so penalized? The private institution in these areas are given large tax exemptions and thus increase the burden of even their poorest taxpayers. Yet because of the high tuition they must charge, their names are only symbols of frustration to the veterans who ought to be their students.

Within a few short years this disappointing loss of money and opportunity for the colleges and junior colleges in States like New York and Vermont will translate into an even more terrible loss of human capital for the industries and businesses of those States and regions. In a technological society such as ours, few factors are as important in determining the productivity of a State, a region, or a nation than the educational level of the work force. The implications of this line of discourse become even clearer and more forceful when we add to them certain observations about our society, the Federal Government, and the way in which they are interacting.

Business throughout the country, for example, can expect to come under increasing pressure from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to hire from among the poor, the nonwhite, and the culturally disadvantaged. These are the same people who, in disproportionate numbers fought the Vietnam war. The war is over now for American soldiers, and what becomes of them will to a large degree reflect the decisions concerning the GI bill, whose primary purpose is to provide opportunity to veterans. If we do not change the present system, too many of them will lie in society like spent cartridge shells, enduring unemployment rates far more severe than the national average and harboring bitter thoughts about the country they faithfully served.

This scenario is not a foregone conclusion but rather the reverse side of the coin of opportunity. I ask you to seize that opportunity by making it possible for every veteran to realistically reach for the best education he can absorb in his State, just as the Congress did after the second World War. I ack you to tell our ex-soldiers that we cherish the quality of their lives as much as we honored the risking of them. Enact a tuition equalizer provision to the GI bill.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Attachments to Mr. Conte's statement follow:]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[Senate Committee Print No. 18]

FINAL REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THREE G.I. BILLS

(Conducted by the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J., pursuant to Section 413 of Public Law 92-540)

10. *The accessibility of postsecondary education for the Vietnam conflict veteran is a function of not only his military service but also his particular state of residence. The effectiveness of the benefits is directly related to the availability of low-cost readily accessible public institutions. The current veteran seeking to use his educational benefits finds that equal military service does not provide equal readjustment opportunities with respect to attendance at postsecondary schools. This is particularly true of institutions of higher education.*

The maximum allowance for payment of tuition, fees, books and supplies provided veterans of World War II allowed them to attend almost any post-secondary institution. At institutions of higher education, veterans were about equally divided between public and private institutions.

Since World War II, tuition levels and other costs at institutions of higher learning have increased substantially and today are two to five times greater. Concomitant with increases in tuition has come a decided shift in total college enrollment from private to public institutions. Since tuition payments reduce funds available for subsistence, the current veteran is attending public institutions to a far greater extent than his non-veteran counterpart. Veteran attendance at low-cost 2-year public institutions is over one and one-third times as great.

Those states with the most highly developed low-cost public educational systems have the greatest degree of participation by Vietnam veterans. There is a strong presumption that veterans living in states without such development benefit less from the GI Bill because they cannot meet the combined costs of education and subsistence.

11. *It appears that the states are subsidizing the cost of education for veterans of the Vietnam Conflict as compared with earlier subsidization by the Veterans Administration. Since higher costs of education appear to reduce participation, this is a significant factor in determining whether the veteran in a particular state will participate in education.*

Analysis of participation rates by state indicate a high correlation between participation and the availability of low-cost, easily accessible institutions of higher learning. Veterans have been somewhat less likely to attend private institutions of post-secondary education than have non-veterans; however, the gap has increased today.

The continued lack of a direct tuition payment is a probable cause. Due to lower costs, Vietnam veterans tend to enroll in community and junior colleges to a greater extent than non-veterans. Thirty-nine percent of Vietnam veterans enrolled in institutions of higher learning are attending community colleges as compared to 29 percent of non-veterans. Participation tends to be high in those states that spend the most money per capita on higher education.

12. *Current benefit levels, requiring as they do the payment of tuition, fees, books and supplies, and living expenses, provide the basis for "unequal treatment of equals." To restore equity between veterans residing in different states with differing systems of public education, some form of variable payments to institutions to ameliorate the differences in institutional costs would be required.*

Generally speaking, the average estimated living expenses will not vary significantly by type of institution attended. However, the amount of benefits available to meet those expenses does vary depending on the availability and type of institution attended.

The veteran residing in a state with a well-developed system of low-cost institutions has significantly more of his benefits available to help defray living expenses than would his counterpart living in a state without such a system.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
November 5, 1973.

Memorandum

To: John Gunther, Executive Director, USCM; Allen Pritchard, Executive Vice President, NLC

From: Stuart Feldman, Veteran Coordinator

Re: Summary Fact Sheet on Adequacy of GI Bill Educational Assistance for Vets

Recent Studies.—A recent study compiled for the V.A. by the Educational Testing Service concludes that the Vietnam veteran has less purchasing power for a four year college education than did the vet of World War II, when adjustments are made for cost of living increases. In addition, they find that whether or not a Vietnam vet can take advantage of his GI Bill benefits depends more on the state in which he resides than upon any other factor.

GI Bill Formulae: The present formula for distributing GI Bill benefits gives veterans a lump sum of $220 per month, or $1,980 per academic year. Out of this he must pay for all educational fees and tuition, plus his living expenses. During WW II, the GI Bill paid for effectively all tuition, books and educational fees—payments going directly to the college chosen by the veteran. In addition, it paid each veteran $75 per month for living expenses. The lumping of all benefits into one $220 per month payment for today's vets should not give the false impression that this is a living allowance comparable to the $75 per month received in WW II.

Consumer Price Index Test: Although changes in the Consumer Price Index are used by the V.A. to defend the adequacy of present benefits, if taken as a major economic indicator, these changes fall short of giving a valid economic profile. For example, if Congress had used the CPI as the measure of what today's minimum wage ought to be, it would have recently voted in an $.81 per hour minimum wage. This indicates the increase, based on the CPI, which has accrued since the $.40 per hour minimum wage of 1948.

GI Bill and Monthly Earnings: In 1948, the $75 per month living allowance received by vets represented 35.4% of average U.S. monthly earnings as determined by the Labor Department. Using that measure today, 35.4% of average U.S. monthly earnings represents $220 per month—ironically the payment Vietnam veterans receive to cover not only living costs but *all educational expenses.*

State Differences: Unless a veteran lives in a state with a large number of community colleges or inexpensive four year colleges, his chances of gaining a higher education are minimal. States like California offer vets $200 per year tuition at public colleges, which abound. Ohio and New Jersey charge $600 to $800. Many states in New England and other sections of the East have relied by nearly 50% on private institutions to provide their higher education. The veteran is, in reality priced out of the private tuition category, such tuition having increases five fold since 1945, averaging out to almost $2,000.

Jobs and Veterans: Additional advantages which were available to WW II veterans constitute an out-of-pocket expense for the Vietnam vet. Special housing subsidies as well as quonset hut, inexpensive student housing was available. No such housing assistance exists today. An abundance of full and part-time jobs resulting from the economic boom in post-WW II years made it relatively easy for a vet to supplement his benefits with real income. Such is hardly the case today, with veterans' unemployment consistently above national averages, having reached 400,000 or 10% in 1977.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Percent, number, and area	April 1973 Vietnam-era veteran population	Percent ever in college under GI bill
35 to 40 percent (771,000 vets):		
1. California	756,000	37.0
2. North Dakota	15,000	36.6
30 to 35 percent (177,000 vets):		
3. Arizona	64,000	34.2
4. New Mexico	32,000	31.0
5. Oregon	81,000	30.9
25 to 30 percent (1,174,000 vets):		
6. District of Columbia	23,000	29.5
7. Idaho	22,000	29.3
8. Utah	40,000	29.0
9. Washington	142,000	28.9
10. Wyoming	11,000	28.9
11. South Dakota	15,000	28.7
12. Hawaii	29,000	28.5
13. Colorado	85,000	27.7
14. Oklahoma	91,000	26.3
15. Kansas	69,000	26.2
16. Florida	224,000	26.1
17. Montana	24,000	26.1
18. Texas	355,000	25.7
19. Nebraska	44,000	25.2
20 to 25 percent (2,220,000 vets):		
20. Michigan	266,000	23.0
21. Wisconsin	130,000	22.1
22. Alabama	93,000	21.9
23. North Carolina	142,000	21.9
24. Illinois	321,000	21.6
25. Missouri	147,000	21.6
26. New York	478,000	21.3
27. Minnesota	133,000	21.2
28. Maryland	139,000	21.1
29. Mississippi	46,000	21.1
30. Louisiana	97,000	20.9
31. Tennessee	119,000	20.4
32. Out of country	75,000	20.3
33. Rhode Island	34,000	20.1
15 to 20 percent (1,953,000 vets):		
34. Arkansas	53,000	19.9
35. Massachusetts	118,000	19.8
36. Connecticut	95,000	19.4
37. Virginia	158,000	19.4
38. Iowa	83,000	19.2
39. Delaware	20,000	18.9
40. West Virginia	46,000	18.5
41. South Carolina	80,000	18.4
42. Alaska	12,000	18.0
43. Nevada	20,000	17.6
44. Maine	30,000	17.5
45. Georgia	152,000	17.3
46. New Jersey	208,000	17.0
47. New Hampshire	28,000	16.9
48. Ohio	336,000	16.8
49. Kentucky	87,000	16.4
50. Pennsylvania	357,000	16.4
10 to 15 percent (181,000 vets):		
51. Indiana	167,000	14.3
52. Vermont	14,000	14.2
Total Vietnam-era veteran population	6,476,000	

Note: National average, 34.4 percent.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TUITION RATES AND BOOK COSTS AT LAND GRANT UNIVERSITIES IN MAJOR STATES AND REMAINDER OF GI BILL FOR LIVING EXPENSES, 1973-74

	GI bill benefits	Tuition	Average book cost	Total cost to veteran	Remainder for living expenses	Living funds for 1 month
California: University of California	$1,980	$644	$216	$860	$1,120	$126.45
New York:						
City University of New York	1,980	70	216	286	1,694	188.23
State University of New York	1,980	[1] 825	216	1,041	939	104.33
Pennsylvania:						
Penn State University	1,980	900	216	1,116	864	96.00
Temple University [2]	1,980	1,050	216	1,266	714	79.33
Texas: Texas Tech University	1,980	292	216	508	1,472	163.55
Ohio: Miami University	1,980	780	216	996	984	109.33
Illinois: University of Illinois	1,980	686	216	[3] 216	1,764	196.00
Michigan: University of Michigan	1,980	852	216	1,068	912	101.33
Florida: Florida State	1,980	570	216	786	1,194	132.66
New Jersey: Rutgers	1,980	725	216	941	1,039	115.44
Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts	1,980	520	216	[3] 216	1,764	196.00
Indiana: Purdue	1,980	700	216	916	1,064	118.22
Virginia: Virginia State	1,980	690	216	906	1,074	119.33

[1] $825 is the average of $750 and $900, the costs of lower division and upper division tuitions, respectively.
[2] Tuition costs for Temple University were not figured in previous years, thus it is not computed in average tuition.
[3] The State GI bills of Illinois and Massachusetts provide free tuition for veterans in those States at public educational institutions.

Note: Average tuition, $650.35; average total cost, $866.35; average monthly cost, $96.26; and average monthly living funds, $105.91.

Living funds available to veterans at major State colleges after payment of tuition and books, academic year 1973-74

	Living funds for 1 month
California: California State at Los Angeles	$177.66
New York: State University College at Cortland	115.11
Pennsylvania: Kutztown State College	112.66
Texas: Southwest Texas State University	163.55
Ohio: Bowling Green State University	109.33
Illinois: Eastern Illinois University [1]	196.00
Michigan: Michigan Technical University	111.55
Florida: Florida A. & M. University	133.77
New Jersey: Montclair State College	120.55
Massachusetts: Southeastern Massachusetts University [1]	196.00
Indiana: Indiana State University	122.66
Virginia: Madison College	123.55

[1] The State GI bills of Illinois and Massachusetts provide free tuition for veterans in those States at public educational institutions.

Note.—All data is figured on the basis of a 9-month school year.
The GI bill carried benefits, before tuition payments, of: October 1969, $130 per month; October 1971, $175 per month; October 1972, $220 per month.
The value of $75 in subsistence (received by World War II vets) in current dollars: 1965, $114; 1970, $121; 1971, $126; 1972, $131; June 1973, $138; February 1974, $174.
$174.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMPARISON OF U.S. AVERAGE MONTHLY EARNINGS TO GI BILL BENEFITS

Date	Average monthly earnings	No dependents: Monthly payment	No dependents: Percent of average monthly earnings	1 dependent: Monthly subsistence payment	1 dependent: Percent of average monthly earnings	2 dependents: Monthly subsistence payment	2 dependents: Percent of average monthly earnings
1948	$212	$75	35.4	$105	49.5	$120	56.6
Before payment of tuition:							
February 1974	637	220	34.5	261	41.0	298	46.9
Funds needed to equal World War II				54		59	
After payment of average tuition and book costs at all public colleges:							
February 1974	637	163	24.0	204	32.1	241	37.7
Funds needed to equal World War II		65		111		119	
After payment of average tuition and book costs at selected 4-year public colleges:							
February 1974	637	124	19.5	165	25.9	202	31.1
Funds needed to equal World War II		101		150		158	

Note: This chart compares veterans benefits in 1948, when subsistence was $75, essentially free and clear, and a direct tuition payment was made to education institutions, covering most tuition, with today's system, where a veteran must pay tuition and living expenses out of 1 sum. The table reveals that a veteran who must pay tuition is at a considerable disadvantage relative to the World War II veteran, when GI bill benefits are measured against average monthly earnings. The married veteran is at a particular disadvantage. A $388 VA figure for annual tuition at all 2- and 4-year public colleges and $216 for books is the basis of the 3d heading. A monthly cost of $96.26 for tuition and books, computed by returning a $1,150.35 average annual tuition fee at representative land grant colleges in the 12 States having 59 percent of the Vietnam veteran population, is deducted from the $220 GI bill payment.

GI BILL ENROLLMENT IN PRIVATE COLLEGES WORLD WAR II AND TODAY

	1947-48 enrollment: Total	1947-48 enrollment: Veterans	1947-48 enrollment: Percent veterans	1971-72 enrollment: Total	1971-72 enrollment: Veterans	1971-72 enrollment: Percent veterans
Stanford University	15,800	7,011	44	18,000	291	1.6
Notre Dame	4,200	3,587	85	6,439	108	1.7
Holy Cross	1,079	939	87	2,379	13	.5
Harvard	5,600	3,326	59	6,073	89	1.5
Yale	5,676	3,365	59	4,739	37	.8
Northwestern	21,128	9,941	47	9,372	90	1.0
Whittier	1,249	507	41	1,815	66	3.6
Johns Hopkins	1,757	1,083	62	2,020	25	1.2
St. Olaf	1,660	564	34	2,650	5	.2
University of San Francisco	2,250	1,496	66	4,728	375	8.0
Xavier University	3,163	1,715	54	2,918	175	6.0
John Carroll	2,246	1,488	66	3,210	187	5.8
Swathmore	1,068	389	36	1,166	10	.9
Pepperdine	4,431	2,299	52	4,641	639	13.8
Northeastern	8,806	7,176	81	29,000	4,403	15.2
Dartmouth	3,167	1,847	58	3,987	95	2.4
New York University	26,438	14,359	54	10,932	453	4.2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A. Tuition Rates at Public Colleges, 1973-74

TABLE A.—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973-74 ACADEMIC YEAR. (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972-73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESES)

	Undergraduate tuition and/or required fees	
	Resident	Nonresident
ALABAMA		
Alabama A&M University	$280(270)	$630(520)
Auburn University	525(450)	1,050(900)
University of Alabama	510	1,020
Alabama State University	405(345)	630(570)
Florence State University	470(450)	470(450)
Livingston University	439(430)	617(603)
University of Alabama—Huntsville	525	1,050
University of Montevallo	360	570
University of South Alabama	579	867
ALASKA		
University of Alaska	472(602)	1,072(1,602)
ARIZONA		
Arizona State University	320	1,210
University of Arizona	411	1,361
Northern Arizona University	330(304)	995(969)
ARKANSAS		
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville	400	930
University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff	400	1,000
Arkansas Polytechnic College	410	940
Arkansas State University	460	700
Henderson State College	400	800
Southern State College	410	650
State College of Arkansas	410	920
CALIFORNIA		
University of California System	644	2,144
California Maritime Academy	1,380(1,080)	1,680(1,380)
California State Polytechnic University:		
Pomona	163	1,156
San Luis Obispo	165	1,308(1,100)
California State Colleges:		
Bakersfield	39	1,100
Dominguez Hills	156(144)	1,256(1,256)
San Bernardino	157	1,270
Sonoma	140	1,345(1,250)
Chico	166(160)	1,276(1,273)
Fresno	168	1,278
Fullerton	160	1,270
Humboldt	163	1,399(1,273)
Long Beach	164	1,369(1,274)
Los Angeles	165	1,256(1,160)
Northridge	154	1,145
Sacramento	160	1,110
San Diego	161	716
San Francisco	166	1,110
COLORADO		
Colorado State University	778(570)	2,068(1,759)
University of Colorado, Boulder	593(576)	1,893(1,893)
Adams State College	471(456)	1,476(1,431)
Fort Lewis College	433(418)	1,537(1,283)
Metropolitan State College	330(333)	1,080(1,062)
Southern Colorado State College	475(450)	1,489(1,389)
University of Northern Colorado	427(402)	1,503(1,200)
Western State College of Colorado	358(349)	1,303(1,315)
CONNECTICUT		
University of Connecticut	715(655)	1,715(1,555)
Central Connecticut State College	570	1,410
Eastern Connecticut State College	524	1,424
Western Connecticut State College	450	1,250
DELAWARE		
Delaware State College	355(345)	930(900)
University of Delaware	585(675)	1,560(1,550)
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
District of Columbia Teachers College	70	1,582
Federal City College	132	852

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A. TUITION RATES AT PUBLIC COLLEGES, 1973-74—Continued

TABLE A.—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND TUITION RATE CHANGES OVER 1972-73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESES—Continued

	Undergraduate tuition and/or required fees	
	Resident	Nonresident
FLORIDA		
Florida A & M University	570	1,470
Florida State University	570	1,470
University of Florida	570	1,470
Florida Atlantic University	570	1,470
Florida Technological University	570	1,470
University of South Florida	570	1,470
University of South Florida	570	1,470
University of West Florida	570	1,470
GEORGIA		
Fort Valley State College	387(67)	937(37)
Georgia Institute of Technology	504	1,419
University of Georgia	540(150)	1,290(1,290)
Albany State College	435	975
Armstrong State College	468(390)	945(930)
Augusta College	300(150)	960(930)
Columbus College	336	936
Georgia College	471	951
Georgia Southern College	507(81)	787(381)
Savannah State College	420(315)	900(780)
West Georgia College	417	957
HAWAII		
University of Hawaii	276(75)	720(750)
IDAHO		
University of Idaho	390(150)	1,290(1,350)
Boise State College	168	1,296
Idaho State University	576(72)	1,176(1,224)
Lewis-Clark State College	240	240
ILLINOIS		
Southern Illinois University	570	1,437
University of Illinois, Chicago Circle	636	1,425
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	606	1,476
Eastern Illinois University	500(93)	1,406(1,437)
Illinois State University	585	1,350
Illinois State University	615(60)	1,272(1,296)
Northeastern Illinois University	474(30)	1,320(1,368)
Northern Illinois University	630(174)	1,650(1,650)
Sangamon State University	477(447)	1,131(1,119)
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville	589(585)	1,457(1,443)
Western Illinois University	594(558)	1,467(1,401)
INDIANA		
Indiana University	682(93)	1,960(1,893)
Purdue University	576	1,656
Ball State University	630	1,260
Indiana State University	666(93)	1,710(1,710)
IOWA		
Iowa State University	606	1,320(1,230)
University of Iowa	630	1,350(1,260)
University of Northern Iowa	600	1,200(1,080)
KANSAS		
Kansas State University	520(78)	1,164(1,092)
University of Kansas	540(90)	1,350(1,260)
Fort Hays Kansas State College	456(60)	936(864)
Kansas State College of Pittsburg	396	864(792)
Kansas State Teachers College	384(36)	888(780)
Wichita State University	534(90)	1,374(1,260)
KENTUCKY		
Kentucky State University	450(90)	990(990)
University of Kentucky	480(60)	1,272(1,152)
Eastern Kentucky University	450(60)	990(930)
Morehead State University	474(60)	936(876)
Murray State University	474(84)	954(870)
Northern Kentucky State College	426(60)	990(930)
Western Kentucky University	450(60)	990(930)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A. Tuition Rates at Public Colleges, 1973-74—Continued

TABLE A—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973-74 ACADEMIC YEAR (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972-73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESIS)—Continued

	Undergraduate tuition and or required fees	
	Resident	Nonresident
LOUISIANA		
Louisiana State University	320	950
Southern University	284	914
Grambling College	337	967
Louisiana Tech University	334(318)	964(948)
McNeese State University	290(280)	530(252)
Nicholls State University	302	932
Northeast Louisiana University	292(270)	922(900)
Northwestern State University	307(294)	932(924)
Southeastern Louisiana University	165	480
MAINE		
Maine Maritime Academy	600	1,350(1,200)
University of Maine		
Augusta	400	1,400
Farmington	400	1,400
Fort Kent	430	1,430
Machias	400	1,300
Presque Isle	400	1,400
MARYLAND		
University of Maryland, College Park	698(639)	1,698(1,439)
University of Maryland, Eastern Shore	345(320)	695(620)
Bowie State College	570(450)	1,070(655)
Coppin State College	520(335)	970(685)
Frostburg State College	636(420)	1,036(770)
Morgan State College	651(460)	1,051(835)
St. Mary's College of Maryland	470(360)	720(710)
Salisbury State College	721	1,179(954)
Towson State College	586(436)	996(886)
University of Maryland, Baltimore City	560(500)	1,560(1,360)
MASSACHUSETTS		
University of Massachusetts	520(469)	1,320(1,169)
Boston State College	369(318)	669
Fitchburg State College	300(250)	600
Framingham State College	300(250)	600
Massachusetts College of Art	405(353)	705(703)
North Adams State College	357(362)	652
Salem State College	300(350)	800(700)
Southeastern Massachusetts University	420(370)	700(650)
Westfield State College	300(250)	600
Worcester State College	395(345)	695(645)
MICHIGAN		
Michigan State University	720(675)	1,620(1,530)
University of Michigan		
Freshman-Sophomore	800(696)	2,600(2,260)
Junior-Senior	904(696)	2,800(2,260)
Wayne State University	704(668)	1,893(1,857)
Central Michigan University	550(510)	1,240(1,110)
Eastern Michigan University	565	1,353
Grand Valley State College	517(460)	1,305(1,224)
Northern Michigan University	495	1,260
Oakland University	602(557)	1,562(1,507)
Saginaw Valley College	510(450)	1,290(1,200)
Western Michigan University	540	1,140
MINNESOTA		
University of Minnesota	592(550)	1,522(1,456)
Bemidji State College	453(416)	827(788)
Mankato State College	333(307)	580(555)
Moorhead State College	333(307)	508(555)
St. Cloud State College	330(308)	578(555)
Southwest Minnesota State College	453(416)	824(737)
Winona State College	477(438)	873(834)
MISSISSIPPI		
Alcorn A&M College	400	1,000
Mississippi State University	506	1,106
University of Mississippi	516	1,116
Jackson State College	400	1,000
Delta State College	436(428)	1,034(1,028)
Mississippi State College for Women	474(465)	1,074(1,065)
Mississippi Valley State College	400	1,000
University of Southern Mississippi	320	920

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A. TUITION RATES AT PUBLIC COLLEGES, 1973-74—Continued

TABLE A—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973-74 ACADEMIC YEAR (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972-73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESIS)—Continued

	Undergraduate tuition and or required fees	
	Resident	Nonresident
MISSOURI		
Lincoln University	376(350)	640(620)
University of Missouri	540	1,540
Central Missouri State University	315(300)	935(900)
Harris Teachers College	205	NA
Missouri Southern State College	300	710
Missouri Western State College	340	720
Northeast Missouri State University	280	760
Northwest Missouri State University	316(300)	600(600)
Southwest Missouri State University	300	900
MONTANA		
Montana State University	476(472)	1,376(1,318)
University of Montana	487(471)	1,387(1,318)
Eastern Montana College	450(445)	1,350(1,292)
Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology	378(375)	1,278(1,222)
Northern Montana College	430(413)	1,330(1,260)
Western Montana College	434(432)	1,334(1,280)
NEBRASKA		
University of Nebraska	484	1,210
Kearney State College	505(403)	865(711)
University of Nebraska at Omaha	600(492)	1,508(1,218)
Wayne State College	555(443)	915(751)
NEVADA		
University of Nevada	519	1,719
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
University of New Hampshire	983(1,033)	2,233
Keene State College	617	1,450
Plymouth State College of the University of New Hampshire	714	1,547
NEW JERSEY		
Rutgers University	725	1,319
College of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey:		
New Jersey Dental School	1,183	1,838
New Jersey Medical School	1,135(1,375)	1,775
Rutgers Medical School	1,200(1,250)	1850(1900)
Graduate School of Biomedical School	635	805
Glassboro State College	535	1,070
College	636	1,171
Montclair State College	679	1,339
Newark College of Engineering	632	1,216
Ramapo College of New Jersey	674	1,209
Stockton State College	666	1,201
Trenton State College	640	1,115
NEW MEXICO		
New Mexico State University	466	1,296
University of New Mexico	456	1,284
Western New Mexico University	333	900
NEW YORK		
City University of New York	70	620
Cornell University (statutory)	1,350(1,200)	1,950(1,800)
State University of New York:		
Freshman-Sophomore	750(740)	1,174(1,165)
Junior-Senior	900(890)	1,400(1,340)
Queens College of City University of New York	138	1,338(1,038)
State University of New York:		
Empire State College	900(786)	1,498(1,234)
Maritime College	800[800]	1,500[900][1]
State University of New York Colleges:		
Binghamton	890[770]	1,390[1,165]
Buffalo	887[737]	1,387[1,162]
Fredonia	800[650]	1,300[1,075]
Geneseo	800[650]	1,300[1,075]
New Paltz	875[775]	1,375[1,150]
Old Westbury	800[650]	1,300[1,075]
Oneonta	800[650]	1,300[1,075]
Oswego	800[650]	1,300[1,075]
Plattsburgh	800[650]	1,300[1,075]
Potsdam	895[885]	1,395[1,385]
	[745(735)]	[1,170(1,160)]
Purchase	650	1,075
Utica-Rome	800	1,300

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A. TUITION RATES AT PUBLIC COLLEGES, 1973-74—Continued

TABLE A.—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973-74 ACADEMIC YEAR (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972-73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESES)—Continued

	Undergraduate tuition and/or required fees	
	Resident	Nonresident
NORTH CAROLINA		
North Carolina A&T University	542(525)	2,075(2,074)
North Carolina State University	474(427)	2,304(2,002)
University of North Carolina	439(422)	1,997
Appalachian State University	485(467)	2,070(2,067)
East Carolina University	438(423)	2,004
North Carolina Central University	443(421)	2,043(2,021)
Pembroke State University	389(390)	1,730
University of North Carolina at Wilmington	368(396)	1,923(1,936)
Western Carolina University	169(166)	691(689)
Winston-Salem State University	490(472)	1,875(1,872)
NORTH DAKOTA		
North Dakota State University	435	1,164
University of North Dakota	456	1,184
Dickinson State College	415(406)	952(943)
Mayville State College	305	852
Minot State College	400	937
Valley City State College	405(396)	942(933)
OHIO		
Kent State University	804	2,004
Miami University	780	1,980
Ohio State University	750	1,800
Bowling Green State University	780	1,179(1,143)
Central State University	663(648)	1,188(1,173)
University of Akron	705	1,065
University of Toledo	780	1,935
Wright State University	780(750)	1,690(1,650)
Youngstown State University	630(570)	1,200(1,050)
OKLAHOMA		
Langston University	337	832
Oklahoma State University	456	1,236
University of Oklahoma	448	1,200
Central State University	340	835
East Central State College	348	843
Northeastern State College	352(345)	847(840)
Northwestern State College	332(327)	827(822)
Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts	335	830
Southeastern State College	355	835
Southwestern State College	330	825
OREGON		
Oregon State University	451(425)	1,633(1,484)
University of Oregon	566(534)	1,743(1,593)
Eastern Oregon State College	549(519)	1,392(1,239)
Southern Oregon College	549(513)	1,392(1,233)
PENNSYLVANIA		
Pennsylvania State University	900(885)	2,100(1,986)
Temple University	1,050(970)	1,950(1,870)
University of Pittsburgh	1,012(882)	2,002(1,972)
Bloomsburg State College	750(700)	1,500(1,400)
California State College	820(770)	1,570(1,470)
Cheyney State College	415(780)	1,576(1,470)
Clarion State College	750(700)	1,380)
East Stroudsburg State College	840(780)	1,470
Edinboro State College	750(700)	1,320
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	750(700)	1,500(1,400
Kutztown State College	750(700)	1,350)
Lincoln University	1,018(1,478)	1,718(1,418
Lockhaven State College	753(700)	1,380
Mansfield State College	NA(760)	NA(1,450)
Millersville State College	750(700)	1,500(1,380)
Slippery Rock State College	750(700)	1,500(1,380)
RHODE ISLAND		
University of Rhode Island	761	1,661
Rhode Island College	490	1,175
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Clemson University	640	1,340
South Carolina State College	480	560
University of South Carolina	570	1,250
Francis Marion College	410	910
Winthrop College	560(470)	1,220(1,130)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A. TUITION RATES AT PUBLIC COLLEGES, 1973-74—Continued

TABLE A.—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973-74 ACADEMIC YEAR (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972-73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESES)—Continued

	Undergraduate tuition and/or required fees	
	Resident	Nonresident
SOUTH DAKOTA		
South Dakota State University	596(510)	1,337(1,132)
University of South Dakota	554(500)	1,259(1,076)
Black Hills State College	525(455)	1,058(874)
Dakota State College	536(488)	1,017(936)
Northern State College	397(345)	390(765)
University of South Dakota at Springfield	492(436)	1,024(856)
TENNESSEE		
Tennessee State University	351	1,761(1,071)
Austin Peay State University	318	1,128(1,038)
East Tennessee State University	378	1,188(1,113)
Memphis State University	348	1,068(948)
Middle Tennessee State University	358	1,168(1,078)
University of Tennessee:		
Chattanooga	416(396)	1,226(1,116)
Martin	414(390)	1,224(1,110)
TEXAS		
Prairie View A&M University	198	1,422
Texas A&M University	288(279)	1,368(1,359)
Texas Southern University	346(214)	1,422(1,364)
Texas Technical University	292(2-0)	1,444(1,442)
University of Houston	256(256)	1,346(1,336)
University of Texas, Austin	378(267)	1,458(1,347)
Angelo State University	300(280)	1,380(1,360)
East Texas State University	322(250)	1,402(1,330)
Midwestern University	170	1,200
North Texas State University	170(152)	710(692)
Sam Houston State University	276	1,255
Southwest Texas State University	270(218)	1,350(1,243)
Stephen F. Austin State University	280	1,360
Texas A&I University Kingsville	270(190)	1,350(1,270)
West Texas State University	280	1,360
UTAH		
University of Utah	480	1,155
Utah State University	453(138)	963(948)
Weber State College	405	810
VERMONT		
University of Vermont	1,088(1,086)	2,688(2,536)
Castleton State College	720	1,850
Johnson State College	720	1,850
Lyndon State College	729	1,850
VIRGINIA		
University of Virginia	672(597)	1,447(1,372)
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	627	1,227
Virginia State College	690	1,350(990)
George Mason College	600(600)	1,410(1,260)
Longwood College	585(560)	925(850)
Madison College	652(642)	1,077(1,077)
Mary Washington College	742(702)	1,547(1,517)
Old Dominion University	420	870
Radford College	480(462)	879(861)
Virginia Commonwealth University	590(540)	1,190(1,080)
WASHINGTON		
University of Washington	564	1,581
Washington State University	564	1,569
Central Washington State College	495	1,351
Eastern Washington State College	495	1,359
Evergreen State College	495	1,351
Western Washington State College	495	1,359
WEST VIRGINIA		
West Virginia University	310	1,110
Bluefield State College	243(210)	992(900)
Concord College	240	990
Fairmont State College	242(222)	992(982)
Marshall University	282	1,082
Shepherd College	280	1,040
West Liberty State College	270(250)	1,070(1,000)
West Virginia Institute of Technology	277(250)	1,027(1,010)
West Virginia State College	250	1,000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A. TUITION RATES AT PUBLIC COLLEGES, 1973–74—Continued

TABLE A.—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE TUITION RATES AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1973–74 ACADEMIC YEAR (WHERE DIFFERENT, 1972–73 TUITION RATES IN PARENTHESIS)—Continued

	Undergraduate tuition and or required fees	
	Resident	Nonresident
WISCONSIN		
University of Wisconsin—Madison:		
Freshman-sophomore	573(558)	1,906
Junior-senior	628(558)	2,006(1,906)
University of Wisconsin:		
Eau Claire	604(528)	1,846(1,673)
La Crosse	611(535)	1,853(1,680)
Oshkosh	602(526)	1,844(1,671)
Platteville	620(544)	1,862(1,689)
River Falls	627(537)	1,869(1,686)
Stevens Point	519(518)	1,717(1,663)
Stout	604(528)	1,846(1,673)
Superior	610(534)	1,852(1,679)
Whitewater	607(531)	1,849(1,676)
WYOMING		
University of Wyoming	411	1,377

Sources: National Association of State Universities and Land-grant Colleges and American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you, Mr. Congressman, for the testimony this morning.

Have you any questions of the witness?

Mr. EDWARDS. I just wish to thank my colleague for very eloquent testimony.

Mr. Chairman, in earlier hearings on this bill did we hear how much it costs?

Mr. HELSTOSKI. There was some estimate by the Veterans' Administration. I don't know about the accuracy of the figures. However, the first year's cost was something like $205 million. It decreased each year until 1979 when the figure given there was some $180 million.

Mr. EDWARDS. Would you agree with those figures?

Mr. CONTE. Yes. Mr. Fellman here, who is my technical assistant, in those hearings we had around the country he said $250 million the first year.

Mr. EDWARDS. We are limiting overpayment of farm subsidies to rich corporate farms. How much are you spending per year?

Mr. CONTE. We are spending up to last year pretty close to $5 billion a year. That really was a tragedy in and of itself. Of course we finally got that amendment out last year as you recall, which should have provided a tremendous saving.

I had 200 Vietnam veterans from my district down Friday. I spent the whole day with them. We had a beer party in my office. We had a lot of bull sessions together and discussed some of these things. The thing I told them, you know, the administration comes up and says this is going to be a blockbuster, it is going to bust the budget, $250 million. I never heard that kind of talk when they were up here year after year asking for $25 billion to fight a worthless war in Vietnam.

If we could burn $25 billion a year in Vietnam we certainly can spend $250 million a year for Vietnam veterans.

Mr. EDWARDS. We are spending nearly $2 billion a year now in Vietnam.

Mr. CONTE. There will be a supplement before Easter; they are asking $490 million for military armament. That is a supplemental for Vietnam. Here we are asking for $250 million. It is peanuts. Why should a guy be limited. There is nothing wrong with our State institutions, nothing wrong with our junior colleges or community colleges. If a guy wants to go to Harvard and he went out and fought that ugly war, he should have the right to go to Harvard.

After World War II we got $500 tuition, $75 a month subsistence and I think room, board, and tuition at Harvard was around $1,350. That veteran of my age would have $100 left over for beer money. Today he gets $220 a month. That comes to $1,980 a year. Room, board, and tuition at Harvard is $4,750. It just does not cut the mustard.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you very much.

Mr. DANIELSON. I want to thank you, Mr. Conte, for your very excellent presentation.

One of the beauties of these hearings today and every day we meet on these bills is that I have never found anybody who is opposed to the bills. I think they are excellent. I think we ought to get to work and pass them. Of course I am very docile and I will wait until the chairman gives the signal. At that time I will recommend the bill for passage. I am all for the bill and I am glad you are. You have done a good job here. As a matter of fact, you are what we lawyers refer to as graphic evidence of the fact that the GI bill did some good.

You and many others like you were able to benefit from the bill and are making a great contribution to the country, and I thank you for it.

Mr. CONTE. Again I want to thank you for squeezing me in. I really appreciate that.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I just want to make one other observation. The comment about what Mr. Vaugh from the VA said. He was asked a question about the problems displayed after World War II. "Do you think VA could manage the program at this time?" His answer was, "Yes, of course. It is not an unmanageable program." Some of those improprieties existed after World War II. This is a new experience we have to fall back on. I want to thank you for your presentation here this morning.

We will now hear Mr. William Byrne.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM N. BYRNE, DIRECTOR, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY VETERANS' ORGANIZATION, ACCOMPANIED BY FRANK LEE, PRESIDENT

Mr. BYRNE. Few ventures of the Federal Government in the past three decades have been so universally designated a success as the GI bill of rights. Its virtues are regularly extolled by political leaders of all persuasions. H.R. 11134 is a prime example.

The latter bill has been introduced by Representative William F. Walsh of Syracuse, a Republican; Mr. Walsh has found strong support in the House and the Senate from liberal Democrats such as Lester Wolff and George McGovern.

Many Members of Congress are indebted to the GI bill for their own education; according to George McGovern 21 Senators and 65 Congressmen enrolled in college after World War II with the benefit of the GI bill.

There has been much in the GI bill to warrant this satisfaction. Again, Senator McGovern credits the same program with producing 450,000 engineers, 360,000 teachers, and hundreds of thousands of professionals in the fields of medicine, law, and science.

In effect, since World War II million of men have been able to extend their education after military service and prepare themselves for more desirable occupations.

The general level of education in the society has been raised significantly. Rather than being a handout, it has been a handup in the development of the whole society.

The GI bill has facilitated the transition to a modern service economy through the upgrading of the labor force and fostering the expansion and democratization of the higher education.

These vital achievements cannot be denied, and yet there have been and are serious flaws with the GI bill. Over the last few years, the major complaint of Vietnam veterans and veterans' organization has been the disparity between the current level of benefits and those available to the World War II veteran.

In the period after 1945 the VA paid for tuition and fees and provided a basic subsistence allowance of $75 per month to a single veteran.

Under the cold war and Vietnam era GI bill originally enacted in 1966, the VA paid only a monthly stipend of $110, from which the student veteran had to pay for tuition, fees, and subsistence.

In 1967, the basic stipend was raised to $130 and in 1970 to $175, a level still well below the World War II level considering the absence of tuition payment and the inflation in the years since 1945.

The most obvious consequence of the lower level of benefits was that large numbers of veterans who desired an education felt that they simply could not afford it.

The participation rates in the program lagged. In the first 36 months of the most recent GI bill 20.9 percent of eligible Viet era vets participated. For the first 36 months of the World War II and Korean GI bills, the participation rates were 25.9 percent and 26.5 percent respectively.

Later statistics indicate the same pattern. In April 1972, 71 months after the current GI bill began, only 37.3 percent of Vietnam era veterans had taken advantage of their benefits. The participation rates after 71 months of the World War II bill was 44.9 percent, for Korean vets 39.8 percent.

The last interpretation was supported by the Harris survey. Vietnam era veterans are discharged from active service with a higher average level of education than their earlier counterparts.

The lower rate of participation, therefore, apparently reflected difficulties in the current GI bill rather than an increased aversion to education.

The last interpretation was supported by the Harris survey. Viet vets who had made no use of the GI bill were asked whether they would do so if benefits were increased. Fifty-three percent indicated that they would; only 7 percent indicated that they definitely would not.

Since the Harris survey, benefits have increased. Legislation passed in October 1972, increased the basic monthly stipend for a single veteran from $175 to $220. Subsequent action in the past 3 months in

both the House and Senate could raise this monthly stipend to at least $250.

Although both actions bring benefits closer to the World War II level, the student-veteran at private colleges and universities is still largely in the financial wilderness.

Veterans' Administration officials expect participation to reach the 50 percent mark set after World War II by late 1973 or early 1974.

However, there is more involved here than participation rates and benefit levels. The GI bill has been cited by many as a model, and I might add that the Carnegie Committee cited it as a model, after a fashion, for more general programs of educational assistance.

It is the larger problem of who gets an education? That is, who has access? How much and what type of education should they receive?

These issues are rooted in matters of individual freedom, institutional autonomy, and distributive justice. It is of more than passing interest that Congressman Walsh's bill refers to the national average for a 4-year public institution as $419. The latter figure was arrived at by a congressionally sponsored study this past year by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, N.J.

The sum of $419 can only be described as a cruel joke for those Vietnam vets who have determined to pursue their education at private universities.

A university such as Syracuse will, in September of this year, have a tuition rate of over $3,000 for the academic year. This latter figure, of course, does not include such matters as room and board, fees, books, et cetera.

It is my contention that the present GI bill discriminates against private colleges, and that the Vietnam veteran is in effect forced into the public education sector.

Thus, the figure of $419 can only reflect the rather nominal tuition fees charged by the public institutions. The practice of direct and full tuition by the VA ended during the Korean conflict because of tuition abuses. It is here then that the practice began of direct monthly stipends to the students.

However, the new system had unintended side effects. It was legislated prior to runaway inflation, and in effect reduced the enrollment at private colleges.

The data indicates that while World War II veterans were slightly more likely to attend private colleges than the general population, Korean and Vietnam veterans have been more likely to attend public institutions. In fairness, it must be conceded that the shift from the private to public sector can be accounted for largely to the rapid growth of public higher education due to factors unrelated to the GI bill:

PROPORTION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS[1]

[In percent]

	Veterans	General population
1947-48	47.8	49.4
1966-67	61.8	56.8
1970-71	77.8	73.8

[1] American Council on Education, Fact Book on Higher Education, 1969 ed., No. 1, p. 5915.

The Korean era GI bill eligibility ended in 1955. The education benefits cost $4.5 billion, compared with $14.5 billion for the World War II period. It was the consensus in the midfifties that the most flagrant abuses of the late forties had been contained.

The issue remained largely dormant throughout the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. In 1966, 2 years after the events in the Gulf of Tonkin, and the escalation of the war in Indochina, a new GI bill was established. In its final form the bill included all veterans who had served since the Korean conflict.

The legislation followed the lines that had been established during the Korean conflict. The system of subsistence allowances to the individual veteran with no tuition payment was retained.

More to the point, so were the benefit levels of the Korean bill, despite 15 years of inflation. It does not require an extensive background in statistics to realize that the Viet vet era benefits were clearly inferior. The essential time element was also less than earlier veterans have received.

Under World War II provisions, a student-veteran received a maximum of 48 months of schooling. Recent legislation has extended the period to 36 months, yet the question remains of why the Viet vet should receive less than his World War II counterpart. At best, 36 months of college should provide a student with a bachelor's degree, the additional 12 months of education within the scheme of higher education. They are in the wording of the Veterans' Administration's law, "predetermined and identified education, professional, or vocational objectives."

As a veteran of both the Armed Forces and academics, I am not making a case for providing each Vietnam era veteran with a higher degree, rather it would be comforting to know that at least any vet with the desire would be supported by his Government through the basics, whether those basics be in plumbing or biochemistry.

Three out of five Viet vets receiving benefits under the GI bill have been attending college-level programs. This proportion is higher than in previous wars, and is due to higher initial levels of education.

VETERANS' EDUCATION LEVEL

	Percent with high school completion at service separation	Percent attending college under GI bill
World War II	45.4	28.6
Korea	62.5	50.7
Vietnam	78.9	60.1

The data indicates that the proportion of high school graduates among separatees has increased 33.5 percentage points since World War II and the proportion of GI bill beneficiaries at the college level has increased 31.5 percentage points, roughly at the same level.

However, although a higher proportion of Viet era vets are attending college, they represent a smaller proportion of college students than did earlier veterans.

In the academic year 1946–47, the peak year of the World War II bill, three out of four male college students was a veteran. The figure in 1974 was more like 1 in 17.

In September 1971, only 2.9 percent were veterans and only 1.5 percent were veterans who served in Indochina. In the junior colleges, Viet era vets constituted 4.8 percent of entering freshmen, in universities 1.9 percent, and in private universities 0.4 percent.

Private institutions provide some graphic data on Congressman Walsh's considered opinion that the Viet vet is being, in fact, forced into the public sector. At Johns Hopkins in 1947–48, there were 1,751 students—1,083 were World War II vets. In 1971–72, Johns Hopkins had 2,020 students—25 were Viet vets. Harvard and 5,500 students in 1947–48—3,326 were vets.

In 1971–72, Harvard University had 6,073 students—89 were vets; in 1973–74 Harvard had 46 Viet vets.

Notre Dame in 1947–48 had 4,220 students including 3,587 vets. In 1971–72, there were 108 vets and 6,139 students.

In 1947–48 Southern Methodist University had 9,011 students and 5,231 veterans; 2 years ago SMU had over 10,000 students and 505 vets. This year at Syracuse University there were 14,000 students, slightly over 1,000 of which were veterans.

The small number of Viet vets at major private universities is only partially due to the fact that there were less veterans produced by the Indochina episode than World War II.

There were, in fact, over 7 million in the Armed Forces during the Indochina hostilities. The most obvious reason for this paucity is the unavailability of tuition payments, which effectively operates to channel veterans into public education, and especially the junior colleges, where 45 percent of college vets are to be found.

Veterans from States, especially in the East, that lack extensive public education systems have less opportunity to utilize the GI bill.

California's State system is well known; 39 percent of California vets have used their GI bill.

In Pennsylvania only 29 percent have used their GI bill, and a paltry 14 percent have gone on to the college level.

Thus, it can be generally stated that Western States with extensive public systems have a high GI bill participation rate; Eastern States, with their strong private tradition, are where private schools are not only numerous, but expensive—here the use of the GI bill remains low.

The sole and original purpose of eliminating tuition payments was to curb abuses—primarily at the vocational or notorious correspondence school level. I am confident that the latter schools are what VA Benefits Director Odell W. Vaughan was referring to this past Friday when he mentioned the tuition formula in the Senate—a bill almost identical to H.R. 11234—as similar to the program after World War II and a "national scandal."

However, the elimination of tuition payments has in effect penalized veterans from States where low-cost college education is limited.

I would argue that by any standards the bill before this committee regardless of its limitations is a long overdue measure and should aid in restoring some semblance of balance and parity with the veterans who preceded us.

The liberalization of benefits would probably improve use of the GI bill among veterans from poorer backgrounds. These men with their inadequate education were the ones to bore the brunt of the Indochina conflict.

If anyone deserves priority from the Nation, it is these men. The Vietnam veteran has been left with a sense of being unclean, as if being in dubious battle reflected on them. We believe that this committee has the courage to separate the honor of the veteran from the conflict.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. Byrne.

Mr. Edwards, do you have any questions of the witness?

Mr. EDWARDS. I wish to thank the witness for this splendid testimony, Mr. Chairman. He has made a persuasive case for the bill.

I was disturbed the other day in reading in the New York Times about the great number of families whose children are in college going into debt very seriously and an unusually high percentage of them find themselves in debt because of the increased cost of keeping their children in college.

Did you happen to see that?

Mr. BYRNE. What date was that? Was that Saturday?

Mr. EDWARDS. I believe it was Saturday.

Mr. BYRNE. That is the day the railroad tracks from New York City were covered in ice and we didn't get papers in Syracuse. We simply did not get the New York Times that day in Syracuse.

Mr. EDWARDS. Also, has it ever been calculated how much the earning capacity of the World War II veterans and the Korean veterans was increased by their being able to go on to college and how much money the Government therefore collected in income tax returns?

I suspect that the $250 million that we are talking about in this bill would be repaid manyfold.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Edwards, I have seen figures which state—and unfortunately I don't have the specific statement and I would have to go back to my material to find the exact quote—that the Federal Government has received 10 times as much in terms of taxes, that the initial investment has been repaid 10 times.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. I think there is some allusion to that in the educational testing service report.

Mr. BYRNE. I believe there is.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Danielson, have you any questions of the witness?

Mr. DANIELSON. No. I just want to thank Mr. Byrne.

Is it Mr. Lee who is with you today? I want to thank you for your testimony. It will be very useful to us.

I repeat, I don't know of anybody who is opposed to this bill. I think it is good to collect all this good testimony, but I would just as soon pass the bill. Thank you very much.

May I ask a question which I guess is rhetorical. Your tuition at Syracuse according to your testimony, is $3,000.

Mr. BYRNE. Slightly over that in September, sir.

Mr. DANIELSON. In that area.

This bill would only bring tuition up to $600. You still have a long way to go on your own, isn't that correct?

Mr. BYRNE. That is correct.

Mr. DANIELSON. This to me is a matter of priority.

When I consider how we spend money on such things as Mr. Edwards pointed out, farm subsidies, assuring a guaranteed support price for

the milk producers, et cetera, and milk is good for everybody, but I think we ought to have something good for students, too. I think this will be money well spent. I don't think it answers all the problems, but I am willing to settle for one slice of bread at a time in working out the problems.

Mr. HEFTEL. I just want to say, this is the first time we have had testimony with citations in the back of the testimony which are supportive of your testimony. Without objection, the citations will be included in the record at the conclusion of your testimony.

I want to thank you for your testimony this morning. It has been very helpful.

We will now hear the Honorable Bob Wilson of California. Mr. Wilson, you may proceed.

STATEMENT BY HON. BOB WILSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to submit testimony on behalf of my bill, H.R. 6474, which would establish an educational loan program for Vietnam era veterans.

This is not a separate tuition payment bill, per se, but the purpose of the legislation is similar: to provide a more viable alternative to the veteran in determining his educational program. With the cost of attendance at private institutions in the thousands of dollars each year, most veterans are unable to consider attending a private university, because of the cost, despite the fact that this particular school might more closely meet their individual educational needs.

I would like to commend this committee for their prompt action early this year in bringing out a bill to increase educational benefits and to extend the eligibility period from 8 to 10 years. I hope that the Senate will act quickly on this legislation, so that it can be enacted into law.

The question that now arises is this: Is this enough? I think not. The cost of tuition and books at many State schools is more than $600 to $1,000 annually. In addition to that, we must consider the cost of maintaining oneself, even at a minimal level, for food and lodging—a difficult task on $2,700 per year for a single veteran, even when supplemented by part time work.

During the last Congress, I sponsored legislation to provide up to $1,000 per year for tuition and books, in addition to a subsistence allowance. Since the prospect for favorable action on such a direct tuition payment seemed very dim, during this Congress I decided to try a different approach—the establishment of a loan program.

I have not, however, abandoned my support for separate tuition payment—and hope that the committee will report such a proposal to the House for a vote in the near future. I would hope that this legislation would contain my proposed loan program, as well. My bill would provide VA insured loans to veterans attending institutions of higher education and pursuing degree objectives with interest subsidy provisions similar to the insured loans under the Higher Education Act of 1965. In addition, the bill provides direct VA loans where insured loans are not available under interest rates prescribed by the Administrator in the veteran's area of residence or not available under the

terms and conditions necessary for approval of an insured loan by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Loans up to $1,500 per year would be available, although the maximum insured loans made to any veteran could not exceed $6,000.

I feel very strongly that a veterans' educational loan program should receive priority consideration. Although the Congress and the administration have devoted considerable attention to providing additional funds for higher education loan programs, sufficient funds have unfortunately not become available to meet the current demand. While we are endeavoring to expand the funds available in higher education loans to all students, I think that we need to pay particular attention to the needs of Vietnam veterans. After interrupting their schooling, and careers to serve in the Armed Forces, these young men returned home to find that their contemporaries, who were not called, had a considerable headstart, in terms of education and job experience. Regardless of their own feelings on the war which they fought, and undoubtedly their views are as diverse as those of the Nation as a whole, these men gave their time and put their lives on the line because their country asked them to do so.

The loans that I am proposing will be repaid, both in terms of the actual cash value of the loan itself, and the investment in our Nation's future productivity and growth. In addition, it will provide greater flexibility to veterans in planning their specific educational programs by making it possible to attend private institutions, which are currently prohibitive costwise. Although the veterans of Vietnam did not receive the hero's welcome which awaited their fathers in 1945, they certainly deserve a similar chance to rebuild their lives. Enactment of a separate tuition grant, such as that given to World War II veterans, as well as my loan program, will go a long way toward assuring the man who patrolled the enemy-infested swamps of the Mekong Delta or the no-man's-land along the DMZ a fair shake back home.

I respectfully urge your favorable consideration of H.R. 6474.

Mr. HERTZBERG. The committee stands adjourned. We will reconvene right after the Easter recess. Next week the full committee will meet on the compensation bill. This subcommittee will meet the Tuesday after the Easter recess.

[Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the committee was recessed subject to call.]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SEPARATE TUITION PAYMENTS FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING,
VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 334, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Don Edwards presiding.

Mr. EDWARDS. The subcommittee will come to order. The Subcommittee on Education and Training of the Veterans Affairs Committee continues its hearings this morning on a number of identical bills to amend chapter 34 of title 38 of the United States Code to authorize additional payments to eligible veterans to partially defray the cost of tuition.

We are honored this morning in having, as our first witness, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Wolff, who has made a great contribution in this important area, and to whom the Veterans Affairs Committee always listens with great respect. Mr. Wolff, we welcome you here today. We are delighted to have you as a witness, and we are going to listen with very keen respect to your statement.

Mr. Walsh, do you have a statement to make?

Mr. WALSH. No. I made my statement before the recess.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Danielson?

Mr. DANIELSON. I have no statement. I am very proud to be one of the coauthors of this bill and I commend both Mr. Wolff, here, and, of course, Mr. Walsh, for their assistance and energy in pushing it forward. I hope we can get these through here this year.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Wolff, you may proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. LESTER WOLFF, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. Danielson and Mr. Walsh. I would be remiss in opening my statement if I didn't thank the gentleman from New York, Mr. Walsh, for his outstanding contribution in this legislation. It seems, Mr. Chairman, that those of us who are represented here today are all cosponsors of this legislation so perhaps we have got a stacked house. However, reading the newspaper this morning, with the story that appeared, Mr. Johnson is about to resign, maybe has removed one of the obstacles in passage of this legislation since, I believe, when the Veterans' Administration testified here, they objected to this legislation. Perhaps this is a happy future for the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate having the opportunity to testify today on the need for further upgrading the GI education bill for Vietnam-era veterans. As a principal sponsor of both the Tuition Equalizer Provision and the very important Comprehensive Vietnam Veterans Benefits Act, I am heartened by the fact that the 93d Congress is taking the lead in advancing meaningful improvements in the present GI bill. The members of this subcommittee and its distinguished chairman, Mr. Holtzman, as well as the presiding chairman, must be commended for their persistance and diligence on behalf of Vietnam vets, in the face of constant opposition by the administration. It is my hope that the administration will eventually benefit from the example set by the Congress and come to admit to the realities of the injustices that have been perpetrated against the Vietnam vet.

Our primary concern today lies with the Tuition Equalizer Provision, which would authorize a direct tuition payment to veterans for tuition costs that exceed the national average of approximately $400, with a ceiling of $1,000. The Tuition Equalizer Provision is aptly named, as it's main interest is to provide an equal opportunity to defer school for veterans who reside in high-cost public education States. At present, the buying power of benefits received by a veteran living in a high-cost public education State is less than half, and in some cases only a third, that of the benefits received by vets in low-cost tuition States.

In my own State of New York, for example, public education costs are over $750, which is more than twice the price of an education in States like Texas and California: And yet, these vets are supposedly receiving equal benefits. I would like to quote for a minute from the Educational Testing Service Report prepared for the VA. The report found that:

> Current benefits levels, requiring as they do the payment of tuition, fees, books and supplies, and living expenses, provide the basis for "unequal treatment of equals." To restore equity between Veterans residing in different States with different systems of public education, some form of variable payments to ameliorate the differences in institutional costs would be required.

This is the quotation from the Educational Testing Service. The tuition equalizer provision we are considering today would provide the variable payment recommended to restore equality to veterans living in States with high-cost education.

I am well aware of the fact that the VA has come before the subcommittee in opposition to the tuition equalizer program. They have cited, as the basis for their opposition, the abuses that accompanied the World War II GI bill, which provided direct payments to the schools for total educational expenses. What we are proposing, however, is not a return to the World War II GI bill program. For one thing, the payment would be made directly to the veteran, not to the school: In addition, the bill expressly prohibits the payment of educational expenses other than tuition. It prohibits fees, books, supplies, and other expenses, which were included in the World War II payment.

This should help to alleviate the VA's fear over the veteran enriching himself at the expense of the Government. Also, the tuition equalizer provision in the comprehensive bill—H.R. 12584—specifically prohibits schools from charging veterans higher tuition rates

than charged nonveteran students. Thus, the VA should not have to worry about institutions trying to take advantage of the tuition payment program. I might also point out that many of the abuses of the World War II program were simply a result of mismanagement on the part of the VA. Granted, one might expect administrative problems to arise from a program that is new; But now that the VA has the benefit of past experience, it should be able to anticipate whatever administrative problems may arise from the tuition equalizer program and manage it more effectively.

The VA also expressed a concern that the Congress not depart from the "longstanding and time-proven philosophy of partial help and equal treatment for equal service." It seems to me that this philosophy of "equal treatment for equal service" is exactly what we are trying to reaffirm with the tuition equalizer plan. The Educational Testing Service report, and I refer to it again, the simple fact that the low-cost tuition States virtually always have a higher rate of GI bill participation than the high-cost education States should serve to dispel the fallacy that the present program actually provides equal opportunities for all vets, and I might include, at this point in the record, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the U.S. Federal tax burden for 1972, in New York State, provided $23,291,950,000, which is 11.11 percent of the total tax burden of the United States. We received back from the Veterans Administration, $386 million which was approximately 7.89 percent of the total VA expenditures. We do have in New York State—we are either No. 1, or No. 2, second to California, in the number of veterans that we provided to the Vietnam war.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Wolff, do you happen to have just what the comparable figures are for the State of California.

Mr. WOLFF. Unfortunately I do not. I am very provincial in that respect.

Mr. DANIELSON. I thought it would enrich the record. It would be nice.

Mr. WOLFF. I would be happy to provide that for the record.

Mr. DANIELSON. Thank you.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, the tuition equalizer provision will, without question, remove the major obstacle preventing vets from entering school, that is, the inability to meet tuition costs. I think we must also realize, however, that there are other obstacles that have been created by the GI bill, especially as regards married Vets with dependents, minority, and educationally disadvantaged vets.

Having had his career of education interrupted, the married veteran has returned from military service faced with two pressing, and in many cases irreconcilable, responsibilities: one, to finish his education or training, and two, to support his family. In effect, the major obstacle facing the married veteran is his inability to support his family under the present education assistance program and at the same time to go to school. If, however, this Vet were able to use all of the benefits to which he was entitled over a shorter period of time he would not only be able to afford to finish his education, but he would also be closer to realizing his goals.

The comprehensive Vietnam Veterans Benefits Act, which as you know includes the tuition equalizer plan, also contains an accelerated subsistence allowance provision. This would allow a veteran to draw his full 36-month entitlement in larger months over a shorter period of time. If his subsistence allowance were $220 a month, he would be able to draw up to $440 a month for only 18 months. This would enable veterans to complete their education with a minimum of money worries. It would also enhance the prospects for those who may wish to attend medical or law school or a 2-year vocation school.

The accelerated subsistence allowance would be particularly helpful to educationally disadvantaged veterans, those with less than a high school education. It is many of these veterans who want to attend a 2-year vocational or technical school. Yet the present GI bill is better designed for those who want to go to a 4-year college. This is probably the major reason why the participation rate for educationally disadvantaged veterans is less than 30 percent. In a way, it is ironic that the GI bill does not make it easier for a veteran to attend a vocational or technical school. Most veterans have already acquired valuable skills and training in vocational and technical fields as a result of their military service, and what this could provide for them would be an additional type of training.

In addition, the Department of Labor predicts that by 1975, there will be over 1 million job openings in vocational and technical areas, and that by 1980, only 1 in 5 jobs will require a college degree. We should begin now to make vocational and technical training an easily accessible goal for veterans, and we can do that by means of an accelerated subsistence allowance that permits them to attend school.

I might also point out that the accelerated subsistence allowance contained in the comprehensive bill requires a veteran to be enrolled in a program of instruction that will lead to a recognized and predetermined vocational, educational, technical, or professional objective before his total benefits are expended. In other words, this is not just something for a dilettante or someone who wants to benefit from some payments from the U.S. Government without meeting the requirements of this act. Now, this requirement leaves little room for abuse of the program: In addition, by creating data on the completion rates of education and training programs, it will give to the VA for the first time a vehicle for assessing the effectiveness of the GI bill.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, because I feel that the tuition equalizer plan and the accelerated subsistence allowance are the two most important additions we can make to the GI bill to truly equalize educational opportunities, I am limiting my discussion to these two areas. However, I would like to point out that the comprehensive bill contains three other provisions which have not yet been acted upon which merit consideration. The first of these would extend the present 36 months entitlement period for up to 9 additional months at the discretion of the VA. This provision is primarily geared toward vets whose studies have been interrupted, who have lost credits through transferring, or who have lacked sufficient preparatory background and need additional courses to complete their education. The second provision would remove the restrictions of the current work study program to enable the VA to use veterans in vitally needed outreach and counseling programs while allowing them to earn money to help

defray tuition costs. Finally, the bill would establish a Vietnam Era Veterans Communication Center and a Veterans Advisory Committee to insure that vets would have an input into programs that affect them and to improve the effectiveness and utilization of the current GI bill.

In conclusion, I would like to recall for you a statement made by the President over 3 years ago: He said, and I quote, "We owe Vietnam veterans a debt of gratitude for their service—but we also owe them something more. We owe them an extra measure of help in making the difficult transition back to civilian life." The Vietnam veteran has not yet received that "extra measure of help", but I think we now have the support in Congress to see that he gets it.

I think we have the support not only for the tuition equalizer provision, which close to 70 Members of the House have cosponsored, but also for the accelerated subsistence allowance and the other vitally needed provisions of the comprehensive bill, which close to 40 Members have introduced. We must abandon our piecemeal approach to the GI bill, and instead make a major commitment to the Vietnam veteran by eliminating all of the inequities inherent in the current program, and I should like to include in the record the cosponsors of the tuition equalizer provision.

Mr. HELSTOSKI [presiding]. Without objection, it will be included in the record.

COSPONSORS OF THE TUITION EQUALIZER PROVISION

1. Abzug
2. Addabbo
3. Badillo
4. Bergland
5. Biaggi
6. Biester
7. Boland (Mass.)
8. Brown (Calif.)
9. Carney
10. Chisholm
11. Clay
12. Cleveland
13. Cohen
14. Collins (Ill.)
15. Conte
16. Conyers
17. Cronin
18. Danielson
19. Drinan
20. Edwards (Calif.)
21. Eilberg
22. Esch
23. Fish
24. Ford
25. Fraser
26. Gilman
27. Grasso
28. Grover
29. Gunter
30. Harrington
31. Helstoski
32. Heckler (Mass.)
33. Holtzman
34. Horton
35. Kazen
36. Koch
37. Kyros
38. Luken
39. Mallary
40. Maraziti
41. Minish
42. Mitchell (N.Y.)
43. Mitchell (Md.)
44. Moorhead (Pa.)
45. Morgan
46. Murtha
47. Nix
48. Owens
49. Pepper
50. Peyser
51. Podell
52. Pritchard
53. Rangel
54. Regula
55. Roe
56. Roncalio
57. Rose
58. Rosenthal
59. Sandman
60. Sarasin
61. Schroeder
62. Seiberling
63. Studds
64. Thompson (N.J.)
65. Tiernan
66. Walsh
67. Wilson (Tex.)
68. Winn
69. Wolff

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Walsh, do you have any questions?

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you for a very comprehensive statement. I believe that the House passed the GI Education bill—the Vietnam Education bill will cost about $562 million a year. Mr. Walsh, you may correct me if you have other figures. Mr. Walsh, your amendments, if enacted, would cost an additional around a quarter of a billion. Is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. That is the final figure we have from the Veterans' Administration and I think it is worthy of comment, if I may, at this time.

Mr. Wolff, who made a very, very fine statement has mentioned the Veterans' Administration, and that figure originally came from the Veterans' Administration. It was $476 million and when several of us challenged that figure, including Mr. Wolff and myself and others, along with people who appeared before the committee, we finally got a more realistic figure, we think is about $250 million. So I don't mean to indicate that the Veterans Administration deliberately distorted their figures they gave to us the first time—they certainly erred on the high side, and when we challenged them, they reduced them. I am afraid this is an indication, and I am delighted to see there is going to be a change in the Veterans' Administration, that this type of information is an indication that the present administration of the Veterans organization is not educationally oriented and it disturbs me very much, and I would hope that when a new administrator is appointed, that the other body will look very closely into the background and feelings about educational provisions for veterans because I do think that it should almost be a condition of his appointment that he be educationally oriented. I don't think the present VA administration has been that. I know we can't make it a condition of appointment but I certainly would hope it would be given every consideration when it comes up.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Danielson, do you have anything?

Mr. WOLFF. If I can, I should like to respond to the question before Mr. Danielson posed relative to the funds that were available, GI payments.

We do have the figures here before us, now.

California got $302 million in 1972.

Mr. DANIELSON. That was "million," wasn't it?

Mr. WOLFF. Yes, $302 million.

New York, for GI payments got $99 million.

I can tell you how much New Jersey got, too.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. If you would.

Mr. WOLFF. New Jersey got $40 million.

Mr. DANIELSON. Does the gentleman have the amount of taxes that California contributed to the Internal Revenue?

Mr. WOLFF. No, but I think it is about the same or a little more than New York.

Mr. DANIELSON. Thank you.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you, Mr. Wolff.

Do you have any further comments to make relative to your statement?

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the witness table one of the regents of the State of New York, Mr. Theodore Black.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Who will be the next witness.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Black is a resident, a distinguished resident of my district as well as being the Vice-Chancellor of the Board of Regents of the State of New York. He has a long, distinguished career in public service. I am sure that he will provide information for us as to the problem that exists in New York State, and will prove to be an excellent witness in source of information for you.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Welcome to the committee, Mr. Black. You may proceed when you are ready.

STATEMENT OF THEODORE M. BLACK, VICE CHANCELLOR, NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF REGENTS

Mr. BLACK. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. Thank you for that kind introduction. For the record, my name is Theodore M. Black. I live in Sans Point, N.Y., and am president of Walter J. Black, Inc., Book Publishers of Rosslyn, N.Y. I served on the New York State Board of Regents for 5 years, and I am now serving as vice-chancellor, as well as Chairman of the Regents Committee on higher professional education, and because of the Regents, themselves, have not taken any formal action on any specific pieces of Federal Legislation, I cannot say I speak for the Regents, but I have consulted with the professional staff of the State Education Department, which is our executive arm, and they join me in supporting the legislation which has been introduced here by Mr. Wolff and Mr. Walsh, among others.

Mr. Wolff has stated very well essentially the reason why this legislation is so necessary. Really, I feel that what we are talking about is equal treatment for veterans. I can understand their point of view, having served 4 years in World War II myself, and I think, perhaps, if I may mention a personal viewpoint, the Vietnam war veteran possibly deserves a bit more of us than we deserved at the end of World War II because he fought a much more lonely fight, and we in civilian life really did not contribute much in the way of sacrifice except to pay our taxes. This is one way, I believe, that we can help to resolve that objection.

I have gone over the legislation with the State education department and I would like to make a few comments on it but let me preface the discussion by saying that in the State of New York, the price, the fee charged for education in the State university is quite high in comparison with what the Educational Testing Service shows is the national average of about $419. The State university charges $650 tuition, in the lower half for freshman and sophomores and charges $800 in the upper half for juniors and seniors.

One factor that enters into the picture in New York, and as well in other States—New Jersey, Massachusetts, and so on, is the fact that we have so many fine private universities in these States, that in creating a great State university and making it available at low cost to our young people, we run the risk of pricing our great private universities out of business and as I am sure others among the witnesses will tell you, that has become a real problem. There are vacancies, many vacancies in private universities, particularly on Long Island in New York, where Congressman Wolff and I come from, so the object of the game really is to continue to provide low-price public education at the post-secondary level, but at the same time to preserve the great private colleges and universities, and I should comment that those in New York today charge an average of about $2,400 a year tuition in the private sector, so whatever can be done to help, particularly veterans, but also others, to achieve a bit of financial independence, making a free choice, is all to the good. I am a firm

believer in pluralism in education at all levels, not only higher and professional, but also elementary and secondary, and there can be none, if by our financial policies, we move everything into the public sector and allow the private universities and colleges to die away, but what this bill addresses itself to, as Congressman Wolff has so eloquently pointed out, is a kind of regional differentiation which proves out in terms of higher costs of education in New York State.

The bill includes the extension of benefits to complete a program already started, as you know, from the 12 weeks in the present situation to 9 months—we endorse that charge heartily. We endorse the change in section 1877 from $220 to $250. As a matter of fact, the Department suggests that even a greater amount might be supported. I should say that in those instances where I find differences between myself and the department, they probably stem from the fact I am a taxpayer and the department is not, but there are very few.

What we are talking about is the justice of the situation with respect to veterans. The regular benefits to veterans, we, of course, support the scale of benefits here. It is a very modest scale and if the money were available, we would suggest that more money be expended upon it but you gentlemen are the experts in that regard. You know how much money of all of the money that is taken in by the Federal Government, can be devoted to this use. The increase in on the farm training is also modest. We do not have any such program in New York, there being no local interest or demand for it but that certainly does not prevent us from supporting it for those who may need it in the other States. Modest increase in predischarge benefits, we also support. We very much support the provision in the bill which extends the period of time during which its benefits may be enjoyed, from 8 to 10 years. That is in the simple chronology of the whole situation, and certainly deserves complete support, and we also support that section of the bill which permits a veteran to expand 4 years of entitlement on a shorter program to use his benefits faster. There is no point in his having unused benefits left after his objective is reached, and these benefits are supposed to be his.

The bill further provides some changes eliminating the 800 man-years limitation and the 100 hours of work limitation work-study programs which we can also support.

We are most enthusiastic over those provisions of this bill which would set up a Vietnam Era Veterans' Communication Center and specifying that the Vietnam era veterans staff such center, and we feel this is an element of this particular bill which should be given top priority and support. I can recall, at the time when I was a veteran, after World War II, wishing sometimes that I could deal with my own contemporaries rather than those gentlemen, however well intentioned, that had only World War I experience, or perhaps none at all. The Vietnam era advisory provision of the bill is excellent and we give that our full support because it will help to insure the responsiveness of the administration and Congress and the Veterans' Administration to the needs of Vietnam era veterans.

We are also in favor, as I said, of the later amendment to the original longer bill—the only suggestion I might have is to construct the rate of payments perhaps between the half-time students and the full-time students on a percentage basis, paying the full-time student completely,

75 percent for the three-quarter time students, and 50 percent for the half-time students. That might be something to which the committee might want to address itself. The fact this bill provides for the payment of benefits directly to veterans is a definite plus. It will avoid the pitfalls which occurred in the original World War II GI bill and which were corrected in the Korean GI bill. We are happy to see this philosophy continued.

I should like to add one other element which you may wish to consider. It pertains to the problem at hand. As you may know, the State of New York has pioneered in this country the external degree program. This is a way in which those who may not have had the advantage of the time to undertake a full-time education, might work independently, work on the job, study under their own auspices to achieve a degree; a degree which we offer now in this program is given only after an examination, which examination is the full equal of an examination which would have to be taken by full-time students to achieve the same degree. The program has been accredited with candidate status by the Middle States Organization and New Jersey has joined with New York in this particular effort. I should tell you that more than 50 percent of those who presently have received degrees under this program have been those who have earned them at least in part during their service in the Armed Forces.

The one problem which I call to your attention is that for technical reasons, the Veterans' Administration has declined to approve payments of any veterans benefits at all to students who are working to achieve their degrees under this particular program, and I believe the rationale given for that is they do not attend full-time classes, are not full-time students, although some of them may attend some classes. I suggest that possibly we may not be doing all of the justice we might do our veterans simply because some of them may not have the time to attend school full time.

Again, I thank you very much for affording me the privilege of being here. I deeply appreciate what you are doing to assure justice for the veterans. Your approach is sound and I commend its approval to the entire committee and to the Congress.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you. Do you have any questions, Mrs. Heckler?

Mrs. HECKLER. No. I wish to thank the gentleman, also.

I see he knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Walsh?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, I do. It is nice to see you again, to welcome you along with Mr. Wolff. It is nice to see these expert New York witnesses come down here, and unfortunately, when we get expert testimony like this, the Senators are never here—and I wish some of them were here to hear this testimony.

I was especially impressed with the support you gave to our payment directly to the veterans. This is one of the provisions the Veterans' Administration has criticized most severely, and I think, there, in the case of the vice chancellor of one of the great institutions in this country, we have sufficient representation of that point of view, and I am delighted that you are supporting that provision.

For the record, I think we should make clear that all of us who have cosponsored this bill realize $600 is not the ultimate goal. It is a

step in the right direction. We all wish it could be more. We know that the veterans deserve more but we feel that it is a beginning, and speaking for myself, I would hope that possibly in the future we may be able to tie this in to a cost-of-living escalator, or something like that to make the tuition payment more realistic. I do want to clear up a couple of things. You mentioned that there are a number of schools in New York State that are in fianancial difficulty, private schools. Are you at liberty to disclose the number of private schools that may be forced to close this year or within the next year or so?

Mr. Black. Mr. Walsh, I would prefer not to because in a public forum, I am very much afraid it might aggravate the situation. I am sure you understand my point of view.

Mr. Walsh. I will withdraw the question.

Mr. Black. The process—may I describe it as one of slow erosion, slow deterioration, as class after class of freshmen is not filled, and that, of course, precedes in the next year to the next class, and the plan has been so contructed, and the faculty has been hired to take care of many more people than are there and sometimes the ability to react by cutting faculty is not quite as fast as we might think it is because of problems of tenure, unionism, and so on; particularly on Long Island, this has really been a problem, and I think you will find one of the other people, speakers, perhaps, going into a little more detail.

Mr. Walsh. Can we infer, from your testimony, although this bill was not designed for the purpose of helping the private schools, it would be of help to them if it was passed?

Mr. Black. Any time that you give a young person some financial help, on whatever justification, and to me there is no higher one than this, and at the same time give him a free choice as to what he may do with it, you are going to help some of the private institutions because he has a chance to go there, so I think the answer to your question must be, yes.

Mr. Walsh. I am delighted to hear you say that.

One other question, and I should know this because I have a daughter in one of the schools in your system, Oswego. You mentioned the average tuition was $2,400 for private schools?

Mr. Black. That is the figure Deputy Commissioner Hollander gave me yesterday. I said I wanted the latest round number figure and he gave me that.

Mr. Walsh. That is not the mate, that is the aggregate?

Mr. Black. That is the aggregate.

Mr. Walsh. As I recall you mentioned $800 or $900 as the tuition—and this is a figure I should know, but I don't——

Mr. Black. State university figure?

Mr. Walsh. Yes.

Mr. Black. $650 for freshman and sophomores and then $800 for juniors and seniors. In the private colleges it is the same for each year, regardless of what year you happen to be in. Of course, city university makes no charge whatsoever.

Mr. Walsh. I have no further questions.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to congratulate the chancellor again, and Mr. Wolff, and indicate that it has been a pleasure working with the members of this committee, and I am so very pleased that all of us are

together on this bill, and I certainly hope we can get it passed, and perhaps with testimony like this, we will be able to do it. I want to thank Mr. Wolff for bringing you down.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, if I can just interject, at this point—there was a cost figure that was requested before—Mr. Walsh, I think, very ably answered the fact this would cost the Federal Government some $250 million additional to what the present costs are.

The other day in testimony, I did mention, and I should like to reiterate the fact that it should be considered that at the present time before another committee that I sit on, we are considering a foreign assistance program, and in that prgram there will be some $600 million that will go to Vietnam, not to Vietnam veterans, this year, to try to put a lid on their inflation, and I think, if we consider priorities in this country, we have got to consider the fact our veterans are just as much a priority as the present people of Vietnam, and if it is inflation we are talking about—what about the inflation that has hit our Vietnam veterans.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mrs. Heckler, do you have any questions?

Mrs. HECKLER. I would like to know, inasmuch as you are responsible for this legislation, as I am also, how you envision this particular bill we are considering before the committee, series of bills on direct tuition payments to veterans, how you would envision this to work in relationship to the legislation we passed earlier? Will it be totally distinct from that and not considered relevant at all?

Mr. WOLFF. I think it should be a separate bill. We did, as you recall—part of our strategy was to wait until the other bill was passed so this would not interfere with the passage of the other legislation. The other legislation should be passed and then this should be passed on its own merits. If we try to put the two together, we are apt to have some difficulties on the floor.

Mrs. HECKLER. I quite agree. Our strategy has not been successful since the other body has not cooperated with us in view of the fact they have delayed in passing on the bill or a variation of that bill. I think we are running into a possibility of having these two measures operate to mitigate each other and that would be very disastrous to——

Mr. WOLFF. Perhaps these things could be resolved in a conference if both bills were passed by the House.

Mrs. HECKLER. I am happy to have the gentleman state his position in relation to both pieces of legislation. I would like to thank him.

Mr. WOLFF. I would like to thank the young lady for her support in this legislation.

Mrs. HECKLER. Thank you.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you, Mr. Wolff. Mr. William Brown and Mr. Gene Clark, cochairmen of the Long Island Collegiate Veterans Forum——

Mr. WOLFF. We do have Mr. Richard Bennett here from Long Island, Hofstra University, whom I would like to present to the committee.

Mr. Bennett is presenting the statement for Mr. Payton, who is president of Hofstra University and Hofstra is one of the leading universities in New York, perhaps in the Nation, and perhaps this will

give you a very clear-cut idea of the veterans of the private schools themselves.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Welcome to the committee, Mr. Bennett. You may begin when you are ready.

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT ROBERT L. PAYTON OF HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY BY RICHARD BENNETT, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO MR. PAYTON

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Congressman Wolff, distinguished members of this committee.

My name is Richard Bennett, and I am executive assistant to the president of Hofstra University in Hempstead, N.Y.

I am appearing on behalf of Mr. Payton who unfortunately had another commitment previously scheduled, so he could not attend, but he felt this was a matter of such importance to him, because he, as a veteran benefitted from the GI bill, that he did prepare a statement and asked me to present it to you for your consideration.

Thank you for this opportunity to describe to you some of the problems veterans face in achieving their educational goals at a private university like Hofstra.

Along with thousands of others from my own generation, I have formed strong convictions favoring the adequate educational assistance for returning veterans. Were it not for the benefits provided under the GI bill at the close of World War II, many of us would have found it impossible to obtain the benefits of a college education. The World War II GI bill was one of the best investments that our country ever made, in terms of human as well as economic development.

As you are aware, the World War II program covered all of the tuition expenses that the student was expected to pay, to a certain ceiling, and beyond that provided allowances for other expenses, but that ceiling, I might add, was adequate for all of the tuition charges at——

This formula was changed for returning veterans of the Korean War and today's returning Vietnam-era veterans are less well served through the GI bill benefits than either of their predecessors were. This has created a difficult situation for many well-qualified and deserving veterans who would like to pursue their higher education on a full-time basis. They find it impossible because the high cost of college education, particularly at the private institutions, compared to similar costs of 15 or 20 years ago.

As a result of this, there are some significant differences for veterans now enrolled at Hofstra, compared with their counterparts of previous generations. For example, in the late 1940's and 1950's most of the veterans entered as freshmen on a full-time basis. Today, most of them enroll as transfer students from our 2-year public colleagues. They are also finding it increasingly difficult to attend on a full-time basis, so that in fact the majority of them are part-time students.

This is a trend that seems to be growing, while the total number of enrolled veterans is declining, particularly in our full-time programs. The following table of the last 2 years demonstrates this point.

Veteran enrollment at Hofstra

	Fall 1971	Spring 1972	Fall 1972	Spring 1973	Fall 1973	Spring 1974
Full time (12 credits or more)	384	359	364	335	284	224
¾ (9 to 11 credits)	109	107	98	93	93	93
½ (6 to 8 credits)	262	262	270	251	288	282
Less than ½ (1 to 5 credits)	142	142	144	136	115	108
¼ (3 to 5 credits)	9	8	0	0	1	0
Total	904	878	876	815	781	707

You can see, in 1971, we had 384 full-time veterans. This spring we have 224, a sharp decrease, while at the same time the number of half-time veterans has increased from 262 to 282, and the total veteran population has declined from 904 to 707.

Through our own resources, the university has always tried to provide special services that we believe veterans need. Specifically, there is a designated person to assist veterans in processing their applications and the forms necessary to receive benefits and to follow up in instances where the veteran has not received their checks in a reasonable period of time. Beyond that, in the dean of students' office, a professional member of the staff has included in his duties the assignments of working with veterans and trying to provide counseling and other services related to their special needs and problems.

Unfortunately, under the existing statutes, Public Law 92-318, the university could not meet the 10 percent increased enrollment required of veterans. We have been unable to obtain assistance to upgrade these services which we think are of great value to our veteran population. The fact that there are over 700 veterans presently enrolled in the university in either full- or part-time status should justify giving support to the university to provide the kinds of counseling and other educational and administrative services that would help veterans achieve their educational objectives.

Unless something is done at the Federal level to increase sharply the level of support that veterans are entitled to receive and to pay a portion of their tuition costs, it is not likely that the trend of declining veteran enrollment will be reversed. In the coming year, tuition at Hofstra will be around $2,600 for full-time students. The costs of tuition, room, and board will be around $4,200 a year. Financial problems are cited by students as the most serious obstacle in pursuing a 4-year degree. And I might add, students presently enrolling at Hofstra will graduate with a personal indebtedness of around $4,000 or $5,000 and some of them will accumulate student loans, unfortunately, in excess of $6,000.

There are hundreds of veterans attending the public 2-year colleges on Long Island who would like to attend a private university like Hofstra for the educational programs we offer, particularly in business and engineering, that meet their educational needs. Many of these veterans apply to Hofstra and are accepted for admission. They are forced to go elsewhere, however, because they cannot afford to pay for both their educational and living expenses. Other veterans who are interested in and qualified for the programs Hofstra offers do not even bother to apply to a private college, they seek out a public institution because even with student loans it is all they can afford.

To limit the veteran's opportunity to pursue a higher education is not in the best interests of our veterans nor is it wise public policy.

A higher percentage of Vietnam veterans came from the ghettos than in past wars, and many have returned to find little opportunity and little hope for the future. These men and women were called to serve their nation in an unpopular conflict half way around the globe, that few understood in the first place. By the time we withdrew our forces, bitterness and disillusionment with this war was widespread at home and abroad.

Now these veterans are back; at least most of them are. Many need jobs, but often the veteran lacks the training and skill to obtain and hold a good job. Education is not the answer to all of the problems our veterans will have to cope with. For thousands of others, however, it can be the means to a better and more productive life.

We should not shirk our responsibility to provide for these veterans an opportunity to achieve a meaningful role in our society. To do any less, we shortchange them and ourselves.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the conclusion of President Payton's prepared statement.

I would, in general response to one of the questions, like to share with the members of this committee the fact that the private colleges in New York State, and perhaps, I think, throughout the northeast, have played a significant role in providing educational benefits to veterans and others and while it is true that the public sector has been growing while the private sector has been declining, it is still a fact, in the State of New York, the private colleges still award about half of the baccalaureate degrees and about 75 percent of the graduate degrees. We still have a significant sector of the educational opportunities available to the veterans.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you for your statement.

Mrs. Heckler, do you have any questions?

Mrs. HECKLER. I would mostly like to congratulate you on your statement. I am particularly interested in your comments about the personal indebtedness of veteran students. Could you submit, for the record, perhaps later, if you don't have the figures available, at this time, how this personal indebtedness affects the veteran, the average amount of indebtedness the veteran incurs during the process of getting a college education at Hofstra?

Mr. BENNETT. I can give you some general comments. For the past 12 years, I have worked in administration and financial aid and to my present position. I was dean of admissions and financial aid, so on a firsthand basis. I have had many years of rather difficult experience counseling veterans where they really had to leave Hofstra. Those that would like to come couldn't afford to because even when they had been borrowing in order to sustain themselves in public institutions, the gap between the tuition charges in the public and private runs about $1,800 to $2,000 a year and to place that additional financial burden on the shoulder of the veteran simply was an obstacle they could not overcome so they either had to seek out the public colleges or forego it altogether, and I think the statistics at our own institution show, while the total veteran population has been declining, there has been a shift away from full-time enrollment to part-time is an additional reflection. These are the people currently borrowing $1,200 to $2,000

a year, in addition to the veterans aid they receive and they are working full-time jobs and that is the reason many of them have had to drop out of full-time study and enter into part-time study which significantly lengthens the amount of time necessary for them to obtain their baccalaureate degree, and in our institution about 50 percent of our students do go on for some form of postgraduate work. It is shared by other students as well but the plight of the veterans puts this in the most graphic situation. They are quite frustrated, frequently, and I am greatly impressed with the sacrifices they have made both while in school and the burdens they have accepted financially in the form of debts to be paid after graduation to achieve their goals. Those that come are well motivated, perform well, academically. Some of them perform on scholarships. We contribute about $2 million toward school scholarships but——

Mrs. HECKLER. How do the veterans fare in seeking out financial aid—compete with other students for that? Is there any benefits they receive? Do they get a priority or go in and take their chances?

Mr. BENNETT. For the academic awards, all students are considered on equivalent basis. We did set $2,500 aside specifically to assist veterans, primarily in the transfer area. As I mentioned, most of the veterans we get, because of the financial situation, come from the 2-year colleges but even with the help we have provided, we find literally hundreds of veterans in the public 2-year colleges in Long Island, would like to transfer. Many of them have family commitments which make it very difficult to leave or work commitments and the financial barriers really present a problem for these veterans.

Mrs. HECKLER. Thank you very much.

Mr. HEFTOSKI. Mr. Walsh, do you have any questions?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, I do. Mr. Bennett, I want to congratulate you on a fine statement. It ties in, I guess, with the philosophy of all of us here. We appreciate it. I have a couple of questions. One relates to the total enrollment of Hofstra.

Mr. BENNETT. The total enrollment, counting graduate, full-time and part-time students is approximately, I think, a little under 12,000, but I think the most significant figure and Regent Black was mentioning this, because we are one of the institutions, full-time day enrollment has been declining for the veterans. This is a reflection of that. We have, from 1970, dropped from a total enrollment of about 6,000 to 5,400 and our expectations next year, because of graduation and because of the increased costs, our ability too attract entering freshman and transfers has been difficult, which may, for the first time in 7 years, drop below 5,000. This does represent a underutilization of our resources and faculty, library and other facilities we have at the university. This represents a greater expense to the taxpayers of our State because the private sector in the State of New York, this past fall, they lost about 4,000 students, while the public gained 12,000. That represents a significant increment educating those students in public institutions.

Mr. WALSH. Thank you. Along these same lines, does the enrollment of the veterans, these full-time students, are they residents at the school?

Mr. BENNETT. The university has resident—most of the veterans we attract are residents of Long Island and most of them tend to be

commuting students. There are a significant number of veterans that reside on campus. The majority of them are commuters and many of them hold jobs and attend college on a part-time basis. Most of them already completed at least half of their baccalaureate degree. They have received their associates degree before they enroll in the university and most of them tend to center in the area such as business management, acounting, marketing, engineering, of course. We do have a great many veterans that pursue the humanities and liberal arts and so forth. The veteran tends to be highly motivated vocationally oriented and most of them have made great sacrifices to get where they are before they come to the university and accept additional financial burdens before they leave in order to obtain the baccalaureate degree.

Mr. WALSH. I assume you have surplus dormitory space?

Mr. BENNETT. At the present time we could accommodate over 300 students in our resident halls and as I mentioned, the total cost of tuition and fees, room and board being over $4,200 with a realistic budget in excess of $5,000 a year. Even for the upper middle-income family, if they have more than one child to educate, you can imagine the financial problems they are encountered with.

Mr. WALSH. The other point I think this committee would be interested in—the fact you mentioned you have set up a program to follow up, in instances where veterans have not received their checks. Has that been a significant problem?

Mr. BENNETT. I am pleased to say it has been less of a problem recently than previously. A couple of years ago we had some real problems in that area, so much so we had to make some special trips down here, but we have had improvements in that regard, and, of course, this is from the veterans. I spent some time talking to them—while everything doesn't go well all of the time, considering the number of checks processed, there is no significant problem as there was a year or two ago.

Mr. WALSH. Thank you very much. I have no further questions.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Wolff, do you have any comments or questions?

Mr. WOLFF. I would just like to say, in addition to what Mr. Bennett has indicated, I can reflect some of the statements that have been made to me by other schools in the New York area, where there are a great number of veterans who are now, while they are going to school, on welfare in order to support themselves, and that is a deplorable situation to think we have these young men who have given so much to our Nation and put them on welfare in order to have them just merely exist. I would also like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I received a call yesterday from the American Legion indicating their wholehearted enthusiastic support of the legislation before the committee. They did testify such, in addition to that. If you recall the Veterans of Foreign Wars, at the time the commander was here, commander in chief was here, in response to a question I threw to him, at that time, he too indicated his support for this legislation. I take it other veterans' organizations are as well supporting the legislation, but these two leading veterans' organizations, I think, is significant.

I thank you for the opportunity of presenting the two witnesses we have this morning. Unfortunately the two college veterans have been

unable to get here in time. I take it they probably had some difficulty in transportation coming down.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. They will not testify then?

Mr. WOLFF. No, they will not.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Very well. We want to thank you for your observations and testimony this morning.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES N. COLLATOS, MASSACHUSETTS COMMISSIONER OF VETERANS

Mr. COLLATOS. Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing me to testify in behalf of the tuition equalizer amendment to the GI education bill which would enable Vietnam era veterans to receive benefits equal to veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

The main purpose of this amendment is to provide a Vietnam veteran who lives in a high-cost education State the same opportunities to enter a school that is denied him now because of his inability to meet the tuition costs.

The most important feature of the tuition equalizer provision is that it will do away with the major deterrent which prevents veterans from continuing their higher education and that is, they are unable to pay the high tuition costs.

This has been proved by statistics that show that low-cost tuition States have a higher rate of veterans taking advantage of the GI bill than States with a high-cost tuition figure.

We must provide equity for Vietnam veterans living in various States with a vast difference in tuition costs, and this can be accomplished by establishing some form of variable payment in order to enable these veterans to have an equal opportunity to obtain the higher education they desire.

I congratulate the chairman and his committee for their perseverance and outstanding efforts to improve the educational opportunities for our Vietnam veterans.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. This committee will stand adjourned until this coming Thursday.

[Whereupon, at 11:10 a.m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene on Thursday, April 25, 1974, at 10 a.m.]

SEPARATE TUITION PAYMENTS FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING
OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommitttee met at 10:10 a.m., pursuant to recess in room 334, Cannon House Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. Henry Helstoski (presiding).

Mr. HELSTOSKI. The meeting will come to order.

Today we will hear testimony from Members of Congress, the first being Congressman John Murphy, who is in the forefront of veterans' educational needs.

Welcome to the committee, Congressman Murphy. We will take your testimony now.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN M. MURPHY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly appreciate the opportunity to be here this morning and to discuss a concern that has been a tremendous concern of this committee, and to compliment this committee on its past actions in assistance to veterans, and also for the action that I am certain will emanate from the hearings and deliberations of the committee.

I am here to testify on behalf of legislation I submitted, H.R. 862, which, in the case of certain eligible veterans, provides for the payment of tuition costs directly to the educational institutions concerned, and also provides for overall increases in education benefits.

These revisions in the GI bill must be made if this program of education and training is to represent both a positive contribution to the Nation's manpower training and a fair measure of compensation to those men and women who served their country during this most recent period of hostilities.

Many have criticized the methods of choosing those men who had to fight this unpopular war, and many have claimed that the method of providing educational benefits is unfair. Those opponents of the draft have felt that the burden of it fell most heavily on those without the family of financial resources to obtain a student deferment.

This has been changed by the Congress. The apparent unfairness of the present GI bill lies in the fact that access to higher education is a function of military service. The likelihood that a veteran will

use his GI bill depends, for the most part, on the structure of higher education which his State has chosen over the course of many years, rather than on his motivation.

This is an injustice which, I hope, this Congress will see fit to correct. I believe that a method of direct payment of tuition up to a maximum of $4,000 yearly, as H.R. 862 provides, is the best way to achieve this end.

The value of the GI bill is certainly not to be questioned. To say that the present system has some flaws is not to say that it is worthless. To the contrary. Over 3.3 million veterans have been trained under the present GI bill, more than half of whom have been trained in 4-year or 2-year institutions of higher learning.

Of this number, almost 400,000 have done graduate work in all academic areas. However, since the GI bill first became effective in 1966, we have not had the facts and statistics available to fully recognize or appreciate its shortcomings. Such knowledge is now more readily available.

The Veterans' Administration's statistics have shown that there is a direct correlation between the cost of education available in any given State and the extent to which veterans make use of their educational benefits.

Thus, in areas such as California, where there is a well-developed and sophisticated system of colleges and junior colleges with tuition rates averaging $160, 37 percent of the Vietnam era veterans make use of their GI bill benefits to attend 4-year colleges and junior colleges.

In my State of New York, however, the situation is quite different. Tuition at colleges of the State University of New York averages $850. Accordingly, the utilization rate of GI bill benefits among New York's veterans is only 21.3 percent.

The price of tuition at various State institutions is not the only factor. Of equal importance is the availability of institutions of higher learning and this varies widely across the country.

The east coast has a tradition of private colleges, with tuition costs generally exceeding even the highest priced State colleges and universities. As a result, and in sharp contrast to the 37 percent utilization rate of educational benefits for 4-year and 2-year institutions among Vietnam era veterans greater than 25 percent.

There is no reason to believe, however, that there is any difference between the desires, motivations, and aspirations of those veterans who live in the East compared with those who live in the West.

The direct tuition method could correct this inequitable situation. After World War II, participants in the GI bill program were awarded their full tuition, books, fees, and supplies, as well as a monthly stipend. The veteran of Vietnam should be accorded the same benefits.

A key point raised by the Veterans' Administration was that of "equal benefits for equal service." I wholeheartedly agree with this concept and it is for this reason that I feel that our Vietnam era veterans are being discriminated against.

Last week several Vietnam veterans from my district came to Washington, seven busloads in all, from two colleges—Richmond College and Staten Island Community College. I had the opportunity of meeting with them and discussing their position after the Veterans' Ad-

ministration refused to let them get out of the rain and use any facility at the Veterans' Administration.

The House extended the caucus room here for that meeting. They gave me a copy of the "Vietnam Veteran Bill of Rights" which I would like to share with you. I introduced it in the form of a House concurrent resolution—460—on April 3, 1974. A copy of the resolution is attached.

They were also accompanied by six busloads of students who were all veterans from Massachusetts. Thankfully, the Massachusetts veterans brought down a busload of apples and that was lunch, not only for the veterans but for myself, my staff, and a few other people on that rainy Friday, as I recall.

Mr. Chairman, these veterans fought hard to defend this country. Our country must now show them that this was not in vain.

It is for this reason that I urge speedy and favorable consideration of legislation which would provide full tuition payment.

Another very key area that I hope the committee does decide to include in its deliberations, and that is a job program, a meaningful job program for veterans. I have recommended that the Vietnam era veteran receive an extra 5-point preference in civil service hiring, and if he was disabled, of course, he would have a 15-point preference in hiring.

The Vietnam vet would have a 10-percent preference. As we know, other veterans have a 5-point preference. I would also hope the committee could go into the question of small business loans or loans of another category to the Vietnam era veteran.

It seems that in the industrialization and retooling in this country following World War II and the Korean war the veteran was a sought-after worker. In this society today of great technical training and necessity, the Vietnam veterans is not a sought-after worker in spite of what military skill he may have learned.

Therefore, I would think that jobs and loans would be a key function of veterans legislation that the committee might well report this year.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of sharing my views with you.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you, Congressman Murphy, for your cogent statement and, as usual, your concern for veterans is quite evident in this respect. As you know, this series of hearings was scheduled to consider a particular group of bills identical to H.R. 11134, and your bill, H.R. 862, was considered last year, prior to our reporting of H.R. 12628. We are very pleased to have your additional statement at this time. The resolution which you introduced, House Concurrent Resolution 460, was not pending when earlier hearings were conducted.

Mrs. Heckler, do you have any questions?

Mrs. HECKLER. I do.

Our colleague gave a very fine statement. I would be very glad to share apples with the gentleman from New York any day. I really feel the record you have helped to compile here will go far to presenting the cause.

I know how many demands there are on your schedule and I think it is important to have put together the kind of record you have helped us compile. I do agree with you, not only in terms of the need for ed-

ucational benefits but also job opportunities, SDA loans, and so forth.

And, of course, it is just incredible to me that for so long these issues have been neglected. I don't know where we have been but the fact is, with your help and others in the Congress who are aware of the problem, we will move forward in this session.

I just wish to thank the gentleman for his very valuable testimony.

Mr. MURPHY. On May 10, the veterans throughout the Nation are going to come to Washington. They are going to ask for parity. Whether it is dollar parity, and just what the Congress decides parity is, when we compare a veteran of World War II who may have had to serve 5 years and then perhaps have come back and served another year or two in the Korean experience with the Vietnam veteran, who is a 2- or 3-year veteran with a minimum of 1 year in combat.

Some people say, what is parity? We must go to the fact that only 1 in 10 eligible young men were selected for this war, so when we talk parity—in World War II we had pretty much a national mobilization where no one was discriminated against. Everybody went.

We discriminated against 1 in 10 and the fact that he didn't serve as long in military service as his World War II counterpart, I think our definition and realization of what parity is, is going to have to be tempered by that fact and also the economic fact of the 1970's.

Mrs. HECKLER. I would say the psychological climate of the Vietnam veteran has come back to experience is hardly as supportive as that of his brother who fought in World War II when he came home as the conquering hero.

The economic problems and psychological climate, the disdain that the American public felt for the war and therefore transmitted one way or another to the Vietnam vet—in no sense is there parity in that either.

So, this concept of parity would be, in a sense, hard to work out. It is hard to measure. But certainly, there should be equality of treatment and fairness to the Vietnam vet. He is carrying a very heavy load and I think, in our society which has spurned him, either because the society could not accept the war itself and he was translated into a symbol of the war and society was looking at its own needs rather than the needs of the Vietnam vet.

There is, I think, a payment due here, his compensation. And I think that kind of equality should be achieved. I have a great deal of feeling for these veterans and I believe they have come back and gotten less, received worse treatment and, in fact, received hostile treatment that they didn't deserve because, after all, they did not establish the policy of war.

Mr. MURPHY. Precisely. The Vietnam vet may seem to be quite a militant lobbyist in his own behalf. We may find on May 10 just how demonstrative he can be, but I would say he is probably less demonstrative than the World War II soldiers in Europe who were in an army of occupation that rioted all over that continent.

If you just go back and really analyze, he was quite militant. The veteran can be militant and probably has the right to be militant. I certainly hope the Congress will properly judge that militancy in meeting the equity for the veteran.

Mrs. HECKLER. All the veterans' organizations have testified in support of Vietnam veterans and I think their demonstrations are really

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

due and fitting. The organizations that have primarily represented World War II veterans have well recognized the Vietnam veterans' cause.

But, for some reason there is a hesitation both in the executive branch and in this Congress, so I think there is a good right to see a demonstration.

Mr. MURPHY. I agree. My advice for the Vietnam veteran is to work with the regular veterans' organizations. There are 29 million American veterans. Many times they feel they have to go it alone.

There is a gap that I have seen develop between the Vietnam veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion in some instances. I think that has to be bridged, and hopefully, it will be bridged by understanding members in both groups.

Mrs. HECKLER. I thank the gentleman for his testimony.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Do you have any questions, Mr. Walsh?

Mr. WALSH. No questions at this time. I am sorry I was late getting here, but I will take a look at the testimony.

Mr. MURPHY. I would like to compliment my colleague from New York on his longstanding interest in the Vietnam veteran and legislative actions in that field.

Mr. WALSH. Thank you very much. I appreciate it. It is nice to have your support.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Our colleague, Mr. Edward Koch, is testifying in another committee and he had asked that his testimony be inserted into the record at this point. Mr. Koch, as usual, provides us with cogent points of view in relation to the Vietnam veteran. Without objection it will be so ordered.

[The document referred to follows.]

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD I. KOCH, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, on April 5th the House in a surprise move rejected the Administration's request for additional military aid to South Vietnam. I applauded that decision; it almost seemed as if our nation was financially emerging from the morass of one of its greatest military and political blunders. Nevertheless that is far from the case: Our disastrous participation in the Vietnam conflict still plagues our nation in the form of this government's complete failure to deal effectively with the 6.9 million veterans of the Vietnam War. Today we concern ourselves with the improvement of the unconscionably poor educational benefits afforded these young veterans. It must be noted, however, that at this time we are facing a much more general veterans crisis in America. One leader of the new American Veterans Movement recently stated, "The people in this country don't seem to realize that the national veterans crisis is a powder keg. If something isn't done, the whole thing is going to explode."

The need for legislation to improve veterans educational benefits, as H.R. 13185 will, is indeed great. It is extraordinary that until the recent publicity generated by the activities of various veterans' groups, many people in this country had the impression that we were providing all the educational assistance we could for the Vietnam veterans. In truth we are doing far less for them than we did for the veterans of World War II and the Korean War. After World War II veterans received tuition paid directly to their schools of up to $500 per year, as well as a $75 subsistence allowance. Under these terms even the most prestigious and expensive universities and colleges were financially open to almost all. Now, the veteran receives only a lump sum of $220 a month. This is hardly enough to cover tuition and cost of living at most publicly supported institutions. Veterans Administration Administrator Johnson contends that the GI bill was never aimed at covering the costs of a "Harvard" education. The facts are that a World War II veteran who attended Harvard College had to personally pay only $25 of his $525 tuition and he still received his $75 a month living allow-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ance; today's veteran who attends Harvard must pay $1,220 not covered by the educational benefits he receives which are supposed to help with tuition *and* living costs. Even if he attends one of the public institutions whose total costs average $1,765, the Vietnam veteran is left with $215 to feed and house himself for nine months. The situation for veterans with dependents is even worse. It is no wonder, then, that whereas nationally the number of young people attending college has tripled since World War II, the number of veterans attending college under the GI bill has failed to double since that time.

I am the sponsor of several bills designed to encourage more veterans to take advantage of the educational benefits to which they are so justly entitled. One, H.R. 685, would allow the transfer of these benefits from the veteran who chooses not to take full advantage of them to his spouse or one of his dependents. Two other bills deal with the period of eligibility for and length of veterans' educational benefits. H.R. 13667 would make a veteran eligible for such benefits all of his life instead of just eight years; H.R. 13666 provides for the extension of the length of educational benefits from 36 to 48 months. This extension helps those who study part-time and cannot complete college in four years as well as those who wish to go into graduate study which, as we all know, is becoming more and more of a necessity in many fields.

Mr. Chairman, the GI bill helped pay for the education of 21 U.S. Senators and 65 Congressmen, including myself, who might not otherwise have had such an opportunity to further their education and enter public service. It created an extremely desirable effect within our society by offering truly equal educational opportunity to millions of young men. Today this is certainly not the case. There have been various proposals to simply increase veterans benefits. The President's 8% proposal is, in light of this nation's 10% inflation rate, thoroughly inadequate; the 13.6% increase recently passed by a unanimous vote of the House is little better. It is my hope that the Senate will raise the percentage of the increase, but even if the figure climbs to 20 or 25%, educational equality of opportunity would still be effectively denied the vast majority of veterans who are of modest means. Those who live in States, such as New York, where the cost of living is high and the public universities' tuitions approximate or exceed the national average and those who wish to pursue programs of study offered by private institutions would continue to be denied the education they desire.

The only way we can hope to achieve any kind of moderate equality of opportunity for the veteran is through direct, variable tuition payments to the veteran himself. H.R. 13185 provides a moderate approach to this end. The veteran would be required to pay the first $419 of his tuition after which the government would pay the remaining tuition up to $600. Clearly inflation and its disproportionate effect on our educational institutions prohibits a complete return to the kind of benefits afforded World War II veterans. Although I am sponsoring legislation, H.R. 7560, which would provide tuition payments up to $1,000, I believe that H.R. 13185 will go a long way toward opening the doors of educational opportunity to millions of veterans.

Unlike under the post-World War II system, the tuition payments provided for by this bill will go directly to the veteran. The money will not be subjected to tuition price fixing and other institutional abuses. It was these abuses of the GI bill by colleges and universities that caused Congress in the 1950's to bring an end to the original variable tuition payments of up to $500 which, as discussed earlier, followed World War II. There are opportunities for abuse of this bill, but it seems unlikely and somewhat denegrating to the vast majority of veterans to suggest that many will choose to sacrifice their education for the sake of swindling the government out of a few hundred dollars. Under the present system it is clear to me that the ones who are being abused are our Vietnam veterans who desire higher education. As for the potential cost of H.R. 13185, I can think of few better ways to spend money than assisting the education of millions who would otherwise possibly not be attending our many educational institutions which are in dire need of funds and, in many cases, students.

Mr. Chairman, the volume of spoken and written material calling for better veterans assistance is immense. The President declares that "far more" should be done for our veterans and then proposes an 8% increase which, with 10% inflation, is really a 2% decrease. Emotional pleas are made in and from Congress, and yet little is done. I will simply conclude my statement by strongly urging the passage of H.R. 13185. It provides for the kind of direct and immediate action which we must take if we are to solve our nation's acute and very real veterans crisis.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. The next witness we will hear are Mr. Thomas Kalaher, of the Veterans' Union at Boston College and Jeffrey Jankot, of Boston College.

These witnesses were brought by the Honorable Margaret Heckler, who is the ranking member of this committee.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS, ACCOMPANIED BY THOMAS KALAHER, VETERANS' UNION, BOSTON COLLEGE, AND JEFFREY JANKOT, BOSTON COLLEGE

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Chairman, I have with me as witnesses, Thomas Kalaher of the Veterans' Union at Boston College, originally a constituent of mine. He is a first semester senior at this point at Boston College.

Also with me is Jeffrey Jankot, a member of the Veterans' Union at Boston College, a Vietnam veteran who is blind and 100 percent disabled.

They have sought to present their testimony in this hearing and came from Boston at their own personal expense. I think the perspective they will present will be very valuable to the committee. There are really hundreds of thousands of Vietnam Vets but we have not heard from enough of them personally.

I have met with them in my district, as have other members of this committee. Because of the significance of their testimony I asked them to present it to the full committee itself.

I would like now to turn over the witness table to Thomas Kalaher of Boston College.

Mr. KALAHER. Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I thank you very much for the opportunity. I have no prepared statement. I go from personal experience.

Veterans have come to the United States as a defeated army to a defeated country. We have received nothing, or very little in the way of assistance in either jobs or education and we have found it very difficult to adjust.

I could cite U.S. Bureau of Labor statistics in areas such as my home in Boston. 18.6 percent higher housing; 9.6 perent higher transportation.

I could also tell you what I get personally a month: $261. I receive $41 dollars for my wife, who, fortunately, has a job, to a total of $2,349 a year. Tuition at Boston College is $2,750. Books are roughly $150, food, conservatively, $900, housing about $1,800 and transportation—I just can't tell.

There are many of us who work with the Office of Veterans' Affairs in Boston College. We are also working with the Veterans' Union in Boston College. Our duties under a bill would supply the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is called the Veterans Cost of Instruction Program, urges us to recruit veterans in Boston College and I personally find it very difficult to recruit veterans into a private college when all they have to look forward to is poverty.

It is quite difficult to be able to maintain this grant so we can do other things for veterans. In order to be able to get this grant we have to be able to show an ability to get our veterans in school with us.

We have contacted 200 veterans who would be willing to come to Boston College. Right now the admission standards at Boston College provide for students from a community college or some other form of undergraduate education with a 2.5 grade average.

A number of State schools require a 3.0 grade average, which would show that it could be easier to get into a quality school, and it is not necessarily a matter of people wanting the best, wanting a Harvard education or Boston College education in lieu of other things, but possibly it is the only place they could go.

I know my personal experience at the University of Massachusetts, I returned from Vietnam in 1971. I was turned down for the University of Massachusetts because I could not take the college boards while I was in Vietnam, and I left too early to take them when they were given in Saigon.

I received blue cards, approximately a dozen of them, saying we need your college boards. So, my only chance to get into school was to go to Boston College. That is my personal experience.

Once again I thank you for the opportunity to be here and I and all veterans support any and all opportunities we can have in order to make us viable in this society.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Walsh, do you have any questions of this witness?

Mr. WALSH. No questions at this time, but we are certainly grateful, Mr. Kalaher, for your coming down here, taking your own time and spending your limited funds. I want you to know I appreciate it very much.

We are very grateful to you and welcome your support and hope we will be able to do something for you.

Mr. KALAHER. Thank you.

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like now to call on Geoffrey Jankot, who is also at Boston College.

Mr. JANKOT. I want to thank you gentlemen for allowing us to meet here. Tom has stated most of our aims. We are all working very hard at Boston College through this veterans cost of instruction program to recruit veterans into universities, colleges, or anything that will help him get off the street and get a job.

He mentioned the cost of Boston College, $2,750 tuition a year. The present GI bill, which pays a certain amount, $220 a month, runs to $1,980 a year, so you have got approximately $800 to make up.

As a Vietnam veteran myself and as most other Vietnam veterans have faced, we came right out of high school or college or an institution and were drafted or enlisted in the service. You don't hold a job before this, so if you did, you didn't hold a permanent job and when you come back, supposedly the job is going to be there.

Except, with Government fiscal programs and what not, the job isn't there. So, somehow you have to supplement your income. As veterans we go out and try to find jobs. In Boston as, I am sure, in any other part of the country, they are just not available.

Being a disabled veteran I fall into the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, which means my tuition is paid and I receive a training allowance every month. This is the only way I could consider even going to school at Boston College, or even consider going to school.

I started out in 1965 at Nichols College, a private college in Massachusetts. I was just out of high school and it cost me $1,450 a year tuition. I thought this was too high for my parents to pay so I left the institution after a year and went to a less expensive university in Oklahoma.

I have gone to schools throughout Texas. I have been through a number of schools. I just decided I couldn't afford it then so I went into the service. One of my reasons for going into the service was the conflict was on, people were being killed. I thought somehow it was a duty just to go.

I realized when I came back I would have the GI bill to help me finish my education. Now you have provided for the disabled veteran and you have provided somewhat for the prisoners of war.

But, every veteran who comes back from Vietnam has a problem. He has a problem of getting a job, he has a problem of adjusting back to society. As Tom has stated, one of the problems is getting into school.

Public education has grown so much. It is so much less expensive than private education that everybody tries to use public education. It makes it very difficult for a Vietnam veteran to compete with these other students.

I think that this bill you have before you will help us quite a bit. Tom has read it to me. It says from $400 to $600, no more than $800. As a single man that will bring us at Boston College to approximately $2,500. We are still going to have to pay another $300, and Boston College is raising its tuition another $100 next year to meet its costs.

So, I hope you can persuade the rest of the legislature into passing this bill to give us whatever financial aid you can. Thank you.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. We want to thank these students who came down and gave of themselves and their time to present their personal experience to the committee. It is very valuable, this story especially, in highly urbanized centers where you have States with the traditional education.

Unfortunately, we are still being victimized by inflationary trends, as you point out. The costs are rising rapidly and rising even before we do anything at all with this particular legislation.

I want to thank you, Mr. Kalaher and Mr. Jankot.

Do you have any questions of the witness, Mr. Walsh?

Mr. WALSH. Again, I would like to congratulate Mr. Jankot and thank him for coming down and taking his time and limited funds to appear before this committee.

I think I should say that the more I look at what we are trying to provide in this bill, the additional $600, sometimes I feel we are not doing enough. Maybe this requires some explanation.

When you take a look at the $2,750 tuition bill you realize that this $600 isn't going to help a great deal. It is going to go a little way. Frankly I wish we were a little more enterprising, but we have to start someplace.

I think the $600 is a beginning and, as you know, we have run into some opposition from the Veterans' Administration on this. We have run into some opposition from both sides of the House on this I am afraid.

So the S680 is a beginning and, hopefully, if we can get this through we can use this as a building block and maybe we can face realistically the costs and concerns the Vietnam era veterans have.

We welcome your support and hope you will continue to support. We recognize your problems and are trying to do something about them. Thank you very much.

Mr. HELSOSKI. Mrs. Heckler, do you have a comment to make?

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to express my gratitude to these young men who are showing initiative to come here at their own expense, using their own time, and to share with the committee and put into this record, which will be published, the experiences that they have felt and which have been a part of their lives since they came back from Vietnam.

The subcommittee has been very dedicated to improving the life of the Vietnam veteran, but obviously, with the bill we have already passed, which is awaiting disposition by the Senate, this bill does not go far enough and now we are attempting a second approach.

I personally feel a sense of commitment to Vietnam vets, not only to listen to testimony but to have the legislation passed not only by this House but by the other body as well. And I know I speak for you, Mr. Chairman, and for you, Mr. Walsh, considering all that you have done to help this whole campaign.

I think these two young men speak for millions of others, and really, they are crying out for help. It is time for our committee to respond. Thank you.

Mr. HELSOSKI. Mrs. Heckler, I want to thank you for being so assiduous. Certainly, your record on this committee is tremendous in regard to your concern for the Vietnam veteran. We appreciate this personalized point of view from Mr. Kalaher and Mr. Jankot.

Thank you. The next witness this morning will be Congressman Brown of California. Mr. Brown, you may proceed.

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman and members of this subcommittee, I am extremely pleased to have the opportunity to come before you today in support of H.R. 13184, which I am cosponsoring. As a former member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Education and Training, I am especially interested in legislation affecting the veteran and ameliorating his situation.

It has become increasingly clear, especially in the last year, that veterans' educational benefits are not only inadequate, but inequitable. As a result of numerous studies in this area, the extent of the inadequacies have become obvious. The lot of the Vietnam veteran is one which places him in a unique position in U.S. history; he has fought a very unpopular war, and has, regrettably, become the object of the bitterness toward the war, a war most Americans would rather forget. Indeed, in a recent Harris survey, a plurality of the American public views the Vietnam veteran as "suckers" who were "taken advantage of." Many veterans, in newspaper interviews, television broadcasts, and hearings on the subject, see themselves in the same light. Surveys of the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature and the New York Times

Index reveal that the World War II veteran is the subject of 10 times as many articles as the Vietnam veteran. The sad truth remains that the Vietnam veteran, unlike his World War II counterpart, is a forgotten American—there were no parades or extravagant homecomings for these veterans. As Senator McGovern and others have observed of the President's attitude with respect to veterans, one would get the impression that only 600 men were involved in the war—the POW's.

It has always been the goal of the GI bill to provide equal readjustment opportunities for equal military service. Sadly, this worthy axiom no longer applies to the Vietnam era veteran. When these veterans returned to civilian life to utilize the educational benefits that are due them, they discovered that the program is absurdly inadequate to their needs. Repeatedly, we hear of foulups in the Veterans' Administration—checks arriving late or not at all; inability, through a massive bureaucracy, to contact the VA about personal problems. This is a bitter and disenchanted group, and rightly so. Often we hear the lament of the Vietnam veteran, "All we want is what our fathers got," and "We're only asking for parity with World War II veterans."

Why is this lament of the Vietnam veteran so often heard? What are the reasons that prompt so much distaste, bitterness, and attention over the Vietnam era GI bill? This is what must be determined if we are to deal effectively, efficiently, and equitably with the Vietnam veteran, and this is what I would like to address myself to today.

In order to fully understand the situation of the Vietnam era veteran, it is necessary to trace the problem to the original inequity; that is, the draft. It is recognized that conscription was certainly less than universal. By employing student deferments, the draft effectively discriminated against lower income individuals, minorities, and high school dropouts. In an intensive study on the Vietnam veteran by the Special Veterans Opportunity Committee of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the report observed that, "The college deferment exempted people from higher income brackets, and lower income men served in their place. Later, these men came home to an economic situation that was rapidly deteriorating * * *." Later in the report, the president of the University of Washington, Dr. Charles Odegaard, also observed:

> Soldiers from Vietnam were not universally conscripted as they were during World War II; more were chosen from among men who could not go to college and who were not granted deferments. Not surprisingly, then, veterans from Vietnam include more financially disadvantaged men and more minorities than previous veteran groups, at least in recent history.

In great part, these are the men that returned to take advantage of the GI bill. However, for various reasons, which I will enumerate, 53.9 percent of the Nation's 6,220,000 Vietnam era veterans have not taken advantage of the GI bill.

An independent study was made last year by the Educational Testing Service, commissioned by the Veterans' Administration pursuant to Public Law 92-540, to provide a comparative analysis of veterans' educational assistance programs of the post World War II, Korean, and Vietnam periods, along with recommendations to improve the present program. This independent study revealed many of the factors necessary to view the problems of the Vietnam veteran, and to place them in proper perspective.

Perhaps the most significant finding of the Educational Testing Service study revealed that the educational opportunity for Vietnam veterans depends more on the State in which one resides than any other single factor. This is due to the fact that the Vietnam era GI bill, unlike the World II GI bill, provides for a single allowance of $220 a month for a single veteran. Of this, the student must pay tuition, books, fees, supplies, food, clothing, rent et cetera. The World War II veteran on the other hand, had his tuition, books, and supplies paid for by the Government, plus a $75 subsistence allowance. It is extremely important here to emphasize three very important factors: (1) the World War II GI bill enabled a veteran to attend any school of his choosing, public or private, since direct tuition payment was made by the Government, (2) the $75 subsistence allowance for a single veteran in 1948 represented 35.4 percent of the national average monthly earnings, and (3) numerous, inexpensive Government-subsidized housing was available for the World War II veteran.

I would now like to address myself to these three factors, and compare them with the Vietnam era veteran. First, the Vietnam veteran is not only almost categorically denied the opportunity to attend a private school, but in many cases, thousands of veterans are excluded from public universities because the State tuition is too excessive to make it feasible to attend. According to the Educational Testing Service study, the average tuition at private colleges has increased approximately five times what it was for World War II veterans, or from $368 in 1948 to $1,980 in 1972. The impact of this kind of leap is clear when we see that, in 1948, 50 percent of all veterans attended private schools; in 1972 only 19 percent of veterans went to private schools. In 1948, for example, 44 percent of Stanford's students were veterans as opposed to 1.6 percent today; at Harvard, 59 percent as opposed to 1.5 percent today; at Notre Dame, 85 percent as opposed to 1.7 percent today.

Whereas private schools are almost out of the question for the vast majority of today's veterans, absurd inequities exist for the veteran in the public university systems. We must remember that, presently, every veteran, regardless of the State in which he resides, receives the same allotment. The tuition rates, however, differ from State to State, and even within States. The veteran attending a public university in New York, for example, pays $890 annual tuition, while the tuition at a California State University is $187 a year, and veterans in Illinois and Massachusetts are provided free tuition. The national average tuition is now $419, or 2¼ times what it was for the World War II veteran. However, in the 12 States with 60 percent of the veteran population, it is $609. The national discrepancies are great, but the veteran has to bear the burden of these discrepancies, simply because he happens to reside in a particular State. This is an extremely important factor, and one not without consequences. The ETS report noted that, "Since higher costs of education appear to reduce participation, this is a significant factor in determining whether the veteran in a particular State will participate in education." The report further recognizes that, "Analysis of participation rates by State indicate a high correlation between participation and the availability of low-cost easily accessible institutions of higher learning." The figures relating to participation bear out this observation. In California, where the cost of public

education is relatively low, veterans used $302 million in benefits in fiscal year 1972, while New York used only $99 million. In April 1973, 37 percent of California veterans utilized the GI bill; in Vermont, where education is more costly, only 14.2 percent used it.

The subsistence allowance for the World War II veteran, $75 for a single man, represented 35.4 percent of the national average monthly earnings. This was considered to be a reasonable amount, in 1948, to provide educational assistance. In order to compare the respective benefits of the Vietnam and World War II veterans, it is not proper for us to merely convert the $75 subsistence allowance into current dollars; rather, we should compare this allowance to the Vietnam veterans' allowance in terms of current national average monthly earnings and, consequently, buying power. According to the Special Veterans Opportunity Committee report, today's single veteran, after paying the average tuition at public colleges, is left with a subsistence allowance of 26.4 percent of today's average monthly earnings. Remember, this is compared to 35.4 percent for the World War II veteran. If we look at veterans with one and two dependents, the difference is even sharper: 49.5 percent for World War II veterans with one dependent, as opposed to 33.1 percent for the Vietnam veteran with one dependent; two dependents, 56.6 percent for World War II veterans compared to 38.9 percent for Vietnam veterans. Since the arguments by those opposed to increasing veterans' educational benefits, including the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, Donald Johnson, is that the purpose of the GI bill has always been to provide educational assistance, not subsidize the veteran in his educational pursuit, these data illustrate quite clearly that assistance is not being rendered to the Vietnam veteran to the same degree enjoyed by the World War II veteran. It is also paradoxical indeed that increases in veterans' benefits are viewed by the administration to be inflationary, while the war expenditures were not.

The third important factor mentioned previously was that low cost Government subsidized housing was readily available for millions of World War II veterans. This is not only not the case today, but, especially in urban areas, rent is extremely high. The veteran has to pay that rent from the $220 per month allowance he receives; in many cities, rent alone approaches that figure. We have then, a veteran who receives a proportionately smaller subsistence allowance than his World War II counterpart, who pays between 2½ to 5 times greater tuition than his World War II counterpart, and who pays far more for rent and food than his World War II counterpart. Clearly, this veteran must seek outside employment to even consider trying to attend school. However, a very high rate of unemployment began in late 1969 and 1970, and has continued—hitting the veteran particularly hard. To emphasize the degree to which veterans were affected by this high rate of unemployment, a Harris survey commissioned by the Veterans' Administration revealed that from 1970 through 1972, while close to 1 million men a year were discharged from the service, unemployment among veterans rose from 100,000 to a high of 400,000—in January of 1972—with the rate exceeding 15 percent and "among nonwhite veterans and those with less than a high school education reaching 21 percent and 31 percent respectively."

We hear numerous reports, from all media sources, of men enrolling in school, trying to find part-time jobs, unsuccessfully, and having to quit, because they simply can't make it. Add to that the frustration of thousands of veterans who are having difficulty receiving their checks—late or not at all. The President's Committee on the Vietnam veteran, in its 1969 report, observed that there was a relationship between delayed payments and low participation in the GI bill:

> The effect of this after-the-fact method of payment can be to discourage program participation by the veteran who cannot afford the initial outlay required by most schools for prepayment of fees, tuition, books, and necessary money for subsistence for himself and his family until the first payment is received. The intent of the program is thus jeopardized.

All these factors point with clarity to the enormous difficulties that Vietnam veterans are experiencing in their educational pursuits. While I have used averages to clarify the situation of the Vietnam veteran, it is apparent that one of the blatant inequities in the present structure is having legislated in terms of averages. Insofar as the veteran is not average, and so forth; resides in a State where tuition is higher, rents are higher, unemployment is higher, it is little consolation to the New York veteran, paying $890 annual tuition, to be told that the national average is $419. This kind of inequity is disgraceful; it is clear that equal military service no longer means equal readjustment opportunity.

While I was heartened that the House unanimously approved the 1974 education and training amendment, it is becoming increasingly evident that simply to increase the benefits for the veteran does not address itself to the inequities in the structure. When some veterans have a living expense budget, after paying tuition, of $197 a month and others, who performed the same service for their country, have only $97 a month to live on, something is indeed wrong with the system.

Congress has a responsibility to be responsive to the needs of all veterans, if it is to claim any equity at all. In one of its conclusions, the independent ETS study stated, "To restore equity between veterans residing in different States with differing systems of public education, some form of variable payments to institutions to ameliorate the differences in institutional costs could be required." Mr. Chairman, this is what would be accomplished by passing the bill before us today, H.R. 13184. This bill addresses itself directly to the recommendations made by the independent ETS study by providing the variable payments necessary to equalize educational opportunity for veterans throughout the United States.

Although not a panacea for all the ills and inadequacies in the present GI bill structure, this bill makes significant strides toward equal treatment for all veterans. It is my hope, however, that we, as legislators, will be able to effect change in the structure, to develop a responsive GI bill closer to the World War II model in the near future. The veteran deserves it, and equity demands it.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you on this important matter, and I commend the subcommittee for its diligence in pursuing this subject.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you, George. The next witness, another former member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Larry Winn.

STATEMENT OF HON. LARRY WINN, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KANSAS

Mr. WINN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee. I am grateful for the opportunity to express my support for legislation on separate tuition payments for Vietnam veterans.

On February 19, 1974, the House passed the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974. As we all know, that bill would increase the amount of subsistence benefits paid to veterans and would extend the time period in which veterans could take advantage of their GI benefits. This is a good bill with respect to meeting some of the problems faced by our Vietnam veterans. But it does not go far enough.

It has been repeatedly brought out in testimony before this subcommittee, and in an extensive study prepared by the prestigous educational testing service, that significant educational problems still confront many of our veterans. Large numbers of our citizens who served faithfully and gallantly in a debilitating and unpopular war now find themselves unable to take advantage of the educational benefits which our Nation owes them.

Tuition costs have increased markedly in nearly all institutions of higher education. The cost of attending many State institutions has increased to the point that, given the present structure of educational benefits, decreasing numbers of veterans are able to attend. Too often only the least expensive community colleges are within the means of our Vietnam veterans.

In Kansas, the State legislature has endeavored to keep tuition charges down. Yet, the resident undergraduate tuition for two-thirds of Kansas' State universities and colleges exceeds the national yearly average of $419.

As the educational testing service's study points out, whether a veteran can avail himself of his GI benefits depends upon the State in which he happens to reside. In too many States the cost of tuition even in State schools, let alone private institutions, coupled with burdensome increases in the general cost of living, mean that veterans must forgo the education that could help them contribute more to our society and realize more from their lives. The payment of the debt we owe these citizens should not depend on such irrelevant matters as the State of their residence.

Based on these facts, I feel compelled to support this legislation providing for variable tuition payments where tuition costs at the college to which a veteran gains admission exceed the national average. This will enable virtually all of our Vietnam veterans to have a real choice of quality educational programs. This is the kind of choice a grateful nation gave their fathers, returning from the Second World War. Our Vietnam veterans deserve no less.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you, Larry. The next witness is Congressman Rangel.

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES B. RANGEL, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, after World War II, the GI bill paid for the tuition, books, and educationa fees, up to $500, of any vet-

eran going to college, and, in addition, gave him $75 per month for living expenses. At that time, $75 per month represented 35.4 percent of the average U.S. monthly earnings. Today, the GI bill gives each veteran attending a college or university $220 per month. At the present time, this $220 per month also represents 35.4 percent of the average U.S. monthly earnings. However, today's veteran is expected to pay for tuition, books, educational fees, and living expenses out of this monthly payment.

In today's technological society, it has become increasingly more important that individuals have either a college education or advanced technical training if they hope to obtain adequate employment. This is particularly true for Vietnam era veterans who must compete for jobs with younger and often times better educated individuals. In the past, the GI bill provided veterans with the opportunity to obtain the education and training they needed to compete in the job market. Ironically, at the present time when such emphasis is being placed on education and training, this is no longer true. As a result of the decreasing amount of benefits provided veterans for education, many of them are being denied the opportunity to compete in today's job market. The high unemployment rate among Vietnam era veterans clearly demonstrates this.

With the high cost of tuition today, some veterans are financially unable, even with the GI benefits, to attend college. In many States, the GI payments do not even cover the tuition costs of the State universities and colleges. Unless they have other funds, all veterans attending school today under the GI bill suffer severe financial hardships which were unknown to World War II veterans.

The legislation which you and the members of your committee are presently considering, H.R. 11681, would authorize the Veterans' Administration to provide additional payments to eligible veterans to defray the high cost of tuition. Under this legislation, the VA would provide payments to the veterans for tuition costs above $400 with no payment to exceed $600. If such legislation were enacted, veterans would have the opportunity to attend colleges and universities whose tuition costs had previously been prohibitive. Further, it would reduce the great disparity between GI benefits paid to World War II veterans and those paid to today's veterans.

As a resident of the State of New York, I am acutely aware of the severe financial burdens which are being placed on today's veteran who is trying to complete his education. New York State colleges and universities have among the highest tuition rates in the United States and New York is second only to California in the number of Vietnam era veterans living and attending school in our State. This legislation would provide many of these veterans, for the first time, with the means of obtaining a college education and, therefore, the means of competing in today's job market. It was with this in mind that I agreed to cosponsor this legislation and it is with this in mind that I appear before you today to urge your favorable action on this bill.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you, Mr. Rangel. We will now hear Congressman Biaggi.

TESTIMONY OF HON. MARIO BIAGGI, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to testify at the hearings sponsored by the Veterans Subcommitee on Education and Training. The legislation which is being considered in these hearings is vital, and I wish to direct my remarks to H.R. 11681, a bill which will take great strides in assisting millions of Vietnam era veterans who are currently finding the pursuit of a decent education to be the biggest battle they have yet had to fight.

The difficulties the Vietnam era veteran is encountering in obtaining a decent education is a national disgrace of enormous significance. The Vietnam war plunged this Nation into an unprecedented era of domestic turmoil and polarization. Yet now, fully 1 year after the war has ended, the bigegst tragedy may just be emerging, that being the Vietnam veteran who returning from the rigors of warfare discovers that the Nation for whom they risked their lives is unable and unwilling to provide them with the opportunities to get or continue an education.

Since World War II, the main source of moneys which veterans have relied on to help defray educational costs has been the GI bill. At the present time, veterans receive $220 a month to meet all the costs of education. When one considers the fact that educational costs have risen at an astronomical rate over the last 10 years, while GI benefits have barely risen, this $220 a month figure represents a woefully inadequate sum. For example the cost of private college tuition for in-state residents has risen 600 percent since 1947.

When you compare the situation which World War II veterans faced with respect to the GI bill, the plight of the Vietnam era veteran takes on added gravity. Under the GI bill, World War II veterans enjoyed full tuition and book costs plus $75 a month for living expenses. With today's inflationary prices, the present GI bill benefit is barely equivalent to the $75 figure provided for living expenses alone!

What H.R. 11681 proposes to do is assist the veteran in meeting the single biggest educational cost, tuition. It will provide an additional payment of up to, but not more than $600 a year to any veteran who attends a college or university whose tuition costs exceed the national average.

This legislation is imperative if we are to reverse the negative trend which has resulted in many of our eligible Vietnam veterans choosing not to pursue their education because the costs had become too prohibitive.

In my home city of New York with its exceedingly high education costs, less than 10 percent of the over 300,000 Vietnam era veterans are using their GI benefits to pursue 2- or 4-year courses of instruction at either a city, public or private school. For the entire State of New York, the figure is barely better, only 20 percent.

The problems become even bleaker for those veterans living in States where there is a scarcity of low cost public educational institu-

tions. For these individuals, their options are severely limited, either attend a private institution, or a State school as a nonresident, both at greatly increased cost.

The high costs and limited benefits are reducing the numbers of Vietnam veterans attending college takes no an even more tragic overtone when measured against the fact that over 70 percent of Vietnam veterans have completed high school, and would likely continue on to college if presented with the opportunity.

This legislation could benefit as many as 40 percent of the over 70 million Vietnam era veterans. For these millions of veterans, life has become such an economic nightmare that one of the first things they have been forced to abandon has been their education.

H.R. 11681, could provide the Vietnam veteran with a double benefit. Not only will he be able to lighten his financial load, but for many, it may represent the difference between attending a lower and higher quality institution.

In today's complex and competitive world, the importance of a college education cannot be emphasized too strongly. The Vietnam veteran more so than many others is acutely aware of this problem. Many of them spent the prime of their educational and employment lives in Vietnam, and now return to an uncertain future, sure of only one thing, they want to continue their education. Yet, instead of the open arms which greeted other returning American veterans, the Vietnam veteran has found closed doors and limited opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the initiative taken today by you and the committee. We in the Congress began on the right track with our passage of H.R. 12628 last month. The 13.6-percent increase in GI bill benefits was an important first step in our efforts to afford veterans, particularly of the Vietnam era, with the same basic educational opportunities which their countrymen enjoy. Yet this was only a first step and much more must be done. This legislation we are considering today will continue this commitment, by allowing for not only increased veterans educational opportunities, but the opportunity for veterans to pursue their educations at the institution of their choice.

Many people have come to refer to 1974 as the year of the veterans in the United States. Yet far more than rhetoric is needed to translate this into reality. Strong legislation and leadership is needed if we are to solve the problems of Vietnam era veterans. In this light, I recently called upon the President and the Veterans Administrator Johnson to create within the VA a new Assistant Administrator for Vietnam Veterans Affairs. This new position could serve to consolidate the present fragmented programs which currently serve the Vietnam veteran.

We recently completed the celebration of Vietnam Veterans Week in the United States. Let us not abandon our efforts on behalf of these brave men. Let us not forget that their return home has been anything but triumphant. They have come home to do battle with such enemies as inflation and discrimination. The Vietnam veteran is weary, tired of fighting, tired of idle promises of help, and above all tired of a Government which seems to have turned their back to them in their hour of need. We have the legislation before us to prove to the veterans of America that their concerns are being heard and

responded to. Let us go forth with vigor and get these bills out of committee and onto the floor where they can be acted on. Each day we delay represents an unconscionable dereliction of duty to the Vietnam veteran who served us so ably in the cause of freedom in Vietnam.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you, sir. We will now hear Congressman Fraser.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN DONALD M. FRASER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify on behalf of H.R. 13185.

This legislation would help close the gap for thousands of young veterans and attempt to reach some parity with the World War II program.

It has been over 1 year since the Vietnam peace agreement went into effect. That agreement brought to an end a massive American involvement that saw over 6 million American enter the armed services. Over 2½ million of them actually served in the war zone. Over 50,000 died. Over 25,000 came home disabled. And almost all of them came home expecting to find a better life than the one they had when they left.

It is certainly no secret that these men have had to face a disappointment upon their return. Vietnam veterans, unlike their predecessors, have had to come home to a cold welcome. They have been unable to find jobs, their elders have regarded them with a great deal of suspicion and the Government has delivered platitudes rather than adequate benefits.

This is most certainly the case with their GI bill benefits. The educational benefits, which helped World War II veterans and Korean veterans are too meager to enable Vietnam veterans to complete their schooling. Under the World War II program, full tuition, books, and supplies were provided, as well as a subsistence allowance. The Vietnam era veteran has to provide his own tuition, fees, supplies, rent, food, and so forth from his monthly stipend which is painfully inadequate. According to the Veterans' Administration's own estimate, the Vietnam era veteran buys $203 a month less with his Government check than did his World War II father.

No one is going to deny that this country owes a great debt to our veterans. But this commitment must be measured in real help, not in rhetoric. Surveys conducted by the Educational Testing Service and the National League of Cities have shown that the present level of the GI bill benefits is not adequate to pay for the kind of education and training necessary to compete in today's job market. It is an irrefutable fact that education costs have risen three times as fast as GI bill benefits over the past 25 years.

H.R. 13185, introduced by Congressman Wolff and cosponsored by myself and others, authorizes additional payments to eligible veterans to partially defray the cost of tuition.

The solution, as presented by this bill, is simple and, according to the cost estimate provided by the Veterans' Administration, relatively inexpensive. While the World War II program included both a subsistence allowance and a tuition payment, the present program includes only a monthly allowance. The Educational Testing Service study

made the point that a variable tuition payment plan is needed to help the veterans who live in States where the cost of public education is considerably higher than the national average. That is exactly what H.R. 13185 does.

According to the VA estimates, the national average yearly tuition for a 4-year public institution is slightly above $400. This bill requires the veterans to pay the first $419, but would provide up to $600 more to cover the remainder of his tuition costs. Thus, out of a total yearly tuition cost of $1,000 for example, the veteran would pay $419 and the VA would pay the remainder. If the tuition were higher than $1,000, the veteran would have to pay the first $400 and any costs above $1,000.

A simple illustration comparing the State of California and my own State of Minnesota provides the best argument for this method of tuition payment. The accessibility of low cost higher education for the Vietnam conflict veteran is a function of his particular State of residence. For example, 37 percent of the California Vietnam veterans have used their GI bill benefits to attend a junior or 4-year college, while only 21.2 percent of Minnesota's Vietnam veterans have enrolled in a similar program.

The inflationary trend in tuition rates and the general cost of education have also had a marked effect with respect to accessibility and use of educational benefits by Vietnam era veterans. There is a much heavier concentration of college-going veterans in public 2-year and 4-year institutions than is found among the veteran college student of the World War II era. Veteran students were about equally divided between public and private institutions in 1948–49. Vietnam era veterans, however, are much more inclined to enroll in public institutions. In fact, of the veteran college students in 1972–73, 81 percent have enrolled in public institutions, and 19 percent have enrolled in private institutions. And, when States are ranked on the basis of cumulative participation rates of Vietnam veterans in 2-year and 4-year colleges as the Educational Testing Service study shows, those States with the most highly developed low-cost public educational systems have the greatest degree of participation by Vietnam veterans.

Higher education is not uniformly accessible to the Vietnam conflict veteran as it was to the veteran of World War II. It is for this reason that I urge swift and favorable consideration of H.R. 13185. The cost of this tuition payment program is estimated to be approximately $200 to $300 million per year. That seems a very small price to pay to assure that our Vietnam veterans achieve parity with their World War II counterparts.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you, sir. We will now hear our colleague, Mr. Roncallo of New York.

STATEMENT OF HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. RONCALLO. Mr. Chairman, over 6 million young veterans who served their country during this most recent conflict have been striving for recognition of their services and their postservice needs. In recent weeks, they have appeared to make their voices heard in a way that may finally convince Congress and the administration that a

special effort must be made to provide an equivalent level of benefits for today's veterans as was provided for those who fought in World War II.

Support for equal educational assistance for all veterans has always been a major platform of both political parties and also of the administration. H.R. 13183 and similar bills may provide the basic vehicle to insure that all veterans, regardless of State of domicile, can participate fully in GI bill usage.

Several months ago the Educational Testing Service, which was commissioned by the Veterans Administration to study and report on the effectiveness of the GI bill for Vietnam era veterans, concluded emphatically that the present GI bill falls short of its World War II counterpart. The World War II program provided veterans with a monthly stipend, as well as fully paying for all tuition costs, books, supplies, and fees. The present GI bill, by contrast, provides only a monthly allowance which is designed to aid the Vietnam veteran in his educational endeavors. The Vietnam veteran must stretch his meager allowance to cover tuition, books, supplies, fees, rent, food, insurance, and so forth. He is forced to meet not only the spiraling cost of education, but also the spiraling cost of living all on $220 a month.

One of the most startling findings of the ETS study was that an important factor determining GI bill usage is the veteran's State of domicile. The present GI bill allowance cannot begin to cover the high cost of education in States which do not have virtually free higher education programs. The very nature of the present program also precludes veterans from attending most private institutions. There are many veterans, particularly in States which do not have low-cost higher education, who simply cannot afford to take advantage of their GI bill benefits. Thus, the Vietnam era veteran is not being treated equally in his educational opportunities.

H.R. 12584 seeks to amend the basic disparate structure of the present GI bill program. It authorizes the Veterans Administration to reimburse a veteran for all tuition costs above $419, with the Veterans Administration payments not to exceed $600. The first figure represents the current national average tuition cost at public institutions. The subcommittee might alternatively consider a variable base to avoid the need for amendments in future years. Such a variable tuition payment plan would serve to equalize educational opportunities for all veterans, regardless of where they live.

Recently, the House passed legislation which would increase by 13.6 percent the monthly subsistence allowance for veterans. This is legislation which I strongly supported. It is unquestionably a step in the right direction if we are going to bring the present veteran anywhere near par with his World War II counterpart. However, we still have a long way to go. This new bill will help bring us one step closer to parity and will help us fulfill the obligation we have to those who have served.

The House has also passed legislation to extend the present 8-year delimiting period to 10 years. I have long advocated completely removing the time limitation within which programs of education for veterans must be completed. Congress has recognized the extra need that recently returned veterans have for readjustment. The Vietnam-

era veteran is unique. The median age of the Vietnam veteran upon discharge is substantially lower than that of other veterans at their time of discharge. In addition, for many veterans, the unpopularity of this conflict has necessitated a longer readjustment period. These two characteristics would indicate a need for a longer delimiting period for the Vietnam veteran to reach that level of maturity, both chronological and psychological, required to make those decisions leading to successful academic pursuits. We must allow our veterans to return to school when they want to in order to learn a profession, and not force them into hasty training, merely to conform to an arbitrary 8- or 10-year delimiting period. I urge the subcommittee to consider totally eliminating the delimiting period when it marks up this legislation.

You might also consider adding some or all of the more comprehensive sections of H.R. 12584, which unfortunately is not on your list of bills under consideration. These include extending the entitlement period for an additional 9 months in individual cases at the discretion of the Veterans' Administration, accelerating payment of educational assistance entitlement, expanding the work-study program, and establishnig a Vietnam Era Veterans Communications Center and a Vietnam Era Advisory Committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is evident that more time and more money is needed if our veterans are to meet their objectives. I believe that H.R. 13183 is a major effort in correcting current deficiencies and inequities in the law and I hope that it and the additional provisions I have suggested will receive speedy and favorable consideration.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you, Mr. Roncallo. Next we will hear the Honorable Claude Pepper of Florida.

STATEMENT OF HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, the current level of education benefits, when adjusted for the average cost of tuition, fees, books, and supplies at a 4-year public institution, represents a significantly smaller proportion of U.S. average monthly earnings than did the subsistence allowance paid to the veterans of World War II. This is unfortunately true whether the veteran is attending a 4-year or 2-year public college, or whether he is single or has dependents. In general, the real value of the educational allowance available to veterans of World War II was greater than the current allowance being paid to veterans of the Vietnam conflict when adjustments are made for the payment of tuition, fees, books, and supplies.

Unlike the veteran of World War II, the Vietnam conflict veteran finds a wide variance in the portion of his educational allowance available for subsistence payments, depending on the tuition and fees of the institution attended.

This committee now has before it a bill which would atempt to close the gap for thousands of young veterans. On February 28 of this year, I joined with Congressman Wolff and others to introduce H.R. 13185 which authorizes additional payments to eligible veterans to partially defray the cost of tuition.

The solution for the present gap in benefit levels is simple and, in the face of all the evidence, an incredibly good investment. While the

World War II program provided both a full tuition payment and a subsistence allowance, the present program provides only a monthly allowance from which the veteran is expected to pay for tuition, books, supplies, rent, food, insurance, et cetera.

The Educational Testing Service study made the point that a variable tuition payment plan is needed to provide help to veterans who live in the States where the cost of public education is considerably higher than the national average. That is precisely what H.R. 13185 does.

According to the Veterans' Administration, the national average tuition for a 4-year public institution is slightly above $400. H.R. 13185 requires the veteran to pay the first $419, but would provide up to $600 more to cover the remainder of his tuition costs. Out of a total yearly tuition cost of $1,000, the veteran would pay $419 and the VA would paid the remainder. If the tuition were higher than $1,000, the veteran would have to pay the first $419, the VA $600, and the veteran would pay any cost above the $1,000.

Participation rates for all Vietnam era veterans in junior and 4-year colleges vary greatly by State, ranging from a low among the contiguous 48 States of 14.2 percent in Vermont to a high of 37 percent in California. An analysis of the availability of low cost, easily accessible institutions of higher learning in each State reveals a strong relationship between participation rates and the availability of such educational opportunities. In addition, veterans have been somewhat less likely to attend private institutions of higher learning than the general college population. As the costs of private education have increased, veterans have been less able to afford enrollment in private institutions than have nonveterans.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 13185 provides a solution to this problem of inequality for an estimated $200 to $300 million. This seems a very small price to pay when considering the needs of the eligible recipients and the ultimate benefits to the entire country. It is no secret that our Vietnam era veterans have faced disappointments and disillusionments in the past year. A VA study recently revealed that 20 percent of returning GI's are experiencing serious and prolonged readjustment problems.

There can be no doubt that a major part of these problems has been caused by the unwillingness of the Congress and the Administration to recognize the need to provide adequate educational and job training opportunities. In addition to fighting an unpopular war, the young veteran has had to face the indifference of a nation known for its generosity.

It is for this reason that I urge speedy and favorable consideration of H.R. 13185.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Thank you, Mr. Pepper. Next we will hear Congressman Kazen.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM KAZEN, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I can be quite brief in my support of this bill to help eligible veterans meet tuition costs. I believe the Congress should provide this assistance for veterans because we should recognize them as a natural and national

resource. As you know, the bill provides that veterans whose tuition costs exceed $419 may receive up to $600 for payment of such fees.

I believe we long ago established the principle that young men and women who left their normal pursuits in education or jobs to serve in uniform should get help on their return to civilian life. We recognized that they had answered the call of our Nation when they were needed in the armed services, and that we should help them readjust when they returned. We have said for years that, just as we help the man who was physically handicapped by service-connected disability, we saw the obligation to help others make up for lost time.

But let us also recognize that we cannot afford to sacrifice a generation of talent. We cannot lose the contribution to our Nation that one group of young people can make. Our country needs scientists, writers, educators, doctors, nurses—the professional list could go on and on—and it should accept a break in the production line because we took young people out of educational institutions and put them into military service.

Our times present a special problem to these young people. I've talked with many of them who have married, perhaps begun families. They tell me with sincere regrets that they fear they must leave their educational efforts to support their wives and children. These times have increased the costs of education, and I sincerely believe it is in the national interest that we help them meet those costs, as we develop their ability to help us all in peacetime as they did so nobly in wartime.

It is for these reasons that I cosponsor this bill.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Finally, we will hear Ms. Schroeder of Colorado.

STATEMENT BY HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO

Ms. SCHROEDER. In 1946 the tuition for a Colorado resident student attending Colorado University at Boulder was $80 per academic year; today the tuition is $593 per academic year, over seven times as much.

In 1946 the tuition at the University of Denver was $360 per academic year. Today the tuition is $2,700 per year.

In 1946 the price of a loaf of bread was 10¢. Today that same loaf of bread costs 56¢.

Because of the tremendous increases in the cost of tuition and the cost of living, it is extremely disheartening to realize that the Vietnam era veteran is not receiving benefits similar to the WW II veteran.

The WW II veteran received up to $500 per school year for tuition, with all fees and books being supplied. In addition, a $75 stipend was provided for living expenses. Even with the 13.6 percent increase in monthly benefits, which recently passed the House, the Vietnam era veteran still falls far short of receiving benefits similar to the WW II veteran.

Why does this difference exist? Is it because the Vietnam conflict was an unpopular war? Is it because we feel that the Vietnam era veteran is less deserving than the WW II veteran?

We cannot ask men and women to give important years of their life in service of their country and then turn our backs on them. We talk about equal opportunity and then continue to short change the Vietnam era veteran.

Where is our conscience? Where is our responsibility?

I have received a letter from Herbert Millard, a veteran of the Vietnam conflict, which concisely outlines the problem facing the Vietnam veteran. Following, in part, is Mr. Millard's letter:

MARCH 20, 1974.

DEAR MRS. SCHROEDER: My name is Herbert Millard. I am a veteran of Vietnam. I have served 4 years of Hell in the Marine Corps. I am also an ex-con.

Tonight on channel 6 I watched a special called "The Washington Connection" which dealt with the Veterans Administration. It is due to this show I now write this letter.

After being discharged from the Marine Corps I was not only a mental disaster area but also, thanks to my experiences in Southeast Asia, a complete and nearly hopeless alcoholic.

In the past 3 years I have had over 30 low-paying, come as they would, jobs. Several months ago I committed an aggravated robbery, was found guilty and sentenced to the Colorado State Reformatory at Buena Vista. Since my release I have attained new status, respect and job opportunities beyond my expectations.

Isn't it a shame that an ex-felon, on a crime of violence, has more future than a man who has fought, been wounded, and undergone mental treatment?

This letter is not one of complaint, nor is it one of commendation. It is a letter expressing a feeling which in my opinion should be conveyed to the American people.

As of this date I have lost all patriotism, devotion, and support for my country, my President and the flag for which it stands. But I still have *hope*.

Respectfully,

H. MILLARD.

Mr. Millard's letter accurately points out the problems which today's veteran faces.

I must also take issue with the December 13, 1973, report from Donald Johnson, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration on H.R. 13183. Mr. Johnson presents two arguments in opposition to this bill. He points out that there were abuses of the tuition payment system by World War II veterans and that these abuses would occur with the payment of tuition to Vietnam-era veterans under the provisions of H.R. 13183. This just doesn't make any sense. The administration can set up guidelines to prevent any such abuses. In fact, that is its job. It is purely an administrative problem, and only indicates to me that Johnson's administrative problems have blocked his view of his real mission—helping veterans.

Mr. Johnson's second argument is high cost. He estimates a probable cost of $250.5 million for the first fiscal year. However, he fails to consider that these moneys are an investment in the future of this country. Senator Alan Cranston has estimated that the financial return of the World War II GI bill was 6 to 1. That is, for every $1 invested to help the veteran better himself, the Government ultimately received a $6 return.

How many potential doctors, lawyers, public servants, inventors, scientists, teachers, ministers, and countless other professionals will we lose to unemployment, crime, drugs, poverty, and despair because of an adequate GI bill.

As members of the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the choice is yours.

I urge your passage of H.R. 13183.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. We will adjourn until the next meeting, which is May 7, for the concluding portion of the hearings.

[Whereupon, at 10:40 a.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Tuesday, May 7, 1974.]

SEPARATE TUITION PAYMENTS FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

TUESDAY, MAY 7, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING
OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 334, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Don Edwards presiding.

Mr. EDWARDS. The subcommittee will come to order.

Today the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the House Veterans Affairs Committee will continue its study and its hearings on H.R. 11134, introduced by our distinguished colleague, Mr. Walsh, as well as identical bill introduced by our colleague Mr. Helstoski, by Mr. Wolff, Mr. Heckler of Massachusetts, and a member of other members of the committee and of the House of Representatives.

I believe this is about the 4th or 5th day of hearings on this particular subject. It is very important insofar as the Veterans Affairs Committee is concerned.

We are pleased to have as our first witness, a most distinguished representative from the State of Iowa, our friend, the Honorable Neal Smith. Mr. Smith, the committee welcomes you, and you may proceed with your statement.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. NEAL SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr SMITH. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I appeared before this subcommittee concerning this same subject matter and in behalf of my bill H.R. 5995 on last July 24 and I appreciate the opportunity to appear again today. I will not repeat everything I said at that time but I do believe that events since that time further fortify the need for action to alleviate the serious problems facing Vietnam veterans who now desire to secure post high school education. Although the House passed a bill containing a small amount of relief, the Senate did not pass it and lack of sufficient support has already resulted in thousands of veterans not having the opportunity to go to school. Testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee upon which I serve again this year clearly illustrated that Vietnam veterans are not receiving the kind of treatment they have a right to expect with regard to educational allowances.

In testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee, it was clear that institutions of higher education are going to depend more and more upon tuition to pay the cost of operating the institution and that tuition rates will rise on an annual basis at a considerably greater rate than the cost of other services in our society. The only way to be fair to these veterans and to provide the increases in the amounts that are needed at the time they are needed is instead of waiting for months for a bill to pass, is to authorize the payment of tuition in whatever amount an institution charges students and in addition to other veterans benefits designed to cover nontuition items.

The Commissioner of Education is now using a figure of $4,300 per year as the average cost for necessities and tuition to attend a private college. Cost at a public institution would on an average be about $1,600 per year less. Although veterans benefits are even inadequate for those in public institutions where the State is paying the $1,600, they are far too low to support attendance at a private institution. To attempt to fashion a benefit schedule in accordance with such figures or basing the benefits upon the cost of attending public schools exclusively is simply ridiculous. Most veterans are not able to attend a public institution for various reasons which members of this committee all know, including family relationships, the wife's place of employment, special school problems, doctors for the youngsters, and other matters which are much more different for adult veterans than they are for a young man or woman who just graduated from high school.

Some support is now being given to including tuition costs but with a limit of $1,000. Although this is some improvement, I think a limit of $1,000 on tuition cost is thoroughly unrealistic. The national average tuition fees for 4-year private colleges during the school year starting next September is estimated to be $2,080. It is no consolation to a veteran who wants to go, or for some reason needs to go, to a college with a $2,000 tuition fee to know that tuition is less at some college located a thousand miles away. This $1,000 limit does not even provide enough to pay nonresident tuition at two of the three public institutions in Iowa. When enlistees and draftees were told a hitch in the service would entitle them to a chance for a post high school education, they were not told they would have to shop for the cheapest school which may not even offer what they prefer as a major.

I think the importance of providing tuition grants on a totally flexible basis is illustrated by the fact that in California where public educational institutions are numerous and the tuition is cheap because the State pays most of it, 38 percent of the Vietnam era veterans were able to use GI entitlement, while in Iowa—which currently ranks 35th in the Nation—only 19.2 percent are using their entitlement. We have three public schools in Iowa, but all of them are located in relatively small cities. The veterans are located where the tuition is higher. Part-time jobs and other ties are in larger cities.

My bill, H.R. 5995 provides that in addition to existing grants a veteran shall be paid exactly the same kinds of expenses which were paid for World War II veterans. I think it is extremely urgent that this approach be taken and that it is in fact a disgrace that this Nation has not provided such benefits long before this time. At the end of World War II in a matter of a few days, Congress passed a GI bill

and made it available to returning veterans. But, here we are several years after some of the Vietnam veterans were discharged and many of them are still being denied the minimum support necessary to permit them to go to school. To make it worse, while World War II veterans at the time they entered the service were not promised the greater benefits, it was clearly understood at the time Vietnam veterans entered the service they would receive the equivalent of the World War II GI bill upon discharge.

Through the draft, these young men were forced to serve at far less than they could have made in private employment. Even my bill would give them only a portion of what they lost financially by serving their country.

All we have a is GI bill for those who live in California or are lucky enough to reside near one of the few higher population areas which have a public institution offering what they want in a State where the State is willing to pay most of the cost of instruction. We don't really have a national GI bill, and we won't have until or unless we go back to the World War II approach.

Timidity, procrastination and plain lack of concern by the U.S. Government on this matter is something for which the Congress must accept a share of the blame. Although the administration has been for even less than the Congress has been willing to provide, that is no excuse for not going forward with an adequate bill and at least trying to pass it, and if necessary, over a veto. In fulfillment of our promise previously made and as a plain basic matter of fairness to these veterans, I strongly urge this subcommittee to approve H.R. 5995 or a similar bill which provides for the full cost of tuition, supplies, equipment, laboratory fees and other necessary expenses generally required of students in addition to existing monthly allowances.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you very much, Mr. Smith. Do you think that the Appropriations Committee would go along with the authorization for this money in the event this committee passed this legislation?

Mr. SMITH. I don't think there is any question about it that they would.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Danielson, have you any comments?

Mr. DANIELSON. I wish to thank my good friend for a fine presentation.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mrs. Heckler?

Mrs. HECKLER. I also wish to thank the gentleman from Iowa. We face the problem in Massachusetts—I am very delighted to know we can share support from our Iowa colleagues. I think this will make a great deal of difference. What we are finding in these hearings is this is a problem we are facing throughout the whole country. As you say, we do not have a national GI bill.

Mr. SMITH. And you live in a higher cost area.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Wylie.

Mr. WYLIE. I also wish to thank the gentleman for an excellent presentation, and I assure you I will study the testimony with great care.

Mr. EDWARDS. The principal author of the bill, Mr. Walsh.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to congratulate my colleague and say it is heartening to see all of the support developing for some kind of equalizer for the Vietnam veterans. More and more of the testimony before

this committee indicates we do owe these Vietnam veterans much in the way of tuition. I was delighted to hear you say it was your impression when these young men went into military service, there was an implied commitment on the part of their Government that they would receive benefits equal to the original GI bill.

Mr. SMITH. As one who went into World War II, I will say we were never promised anything. We were getting more than we were promised.

Mr. WALSH. That is right, and I think we have a real moral obligation in this case, rather than just the obligation to pay them for the great service they rendered to this country.

Mr. EDWARDS. I don't want the record to show we don't have similar problems in California. We have some great institutions of higher learning where the tuition is just as high as in other parts of the country. It is unfair to California, too, if they can't have these institutions.

Thank you very much for this very helpful testimony.

Our next witness is the distinguished member from California, the Honorable William M. Ketchum.

We welcome you. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. KETCHUM. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman in regard to the State of California.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to extend my sincere thanks to you and the members of this subcommittee for this opportunity to appear before you in support of payment of tuition costs for veterans pursuing a higher education. I recall the courtesy extended by this subcommittee when I testified on this very issue in September 1973, and appreciate the opportunity to extend my remarks today. Mr. Chairman, for the past 18 months I have been in frequent contact with veterans' organizations on campuses throughout my congressional district. The overwhelming impression I receive from these young men is a sense of being forgotten of frustration and bitterness caused by public indifference to the Vietnam veteran.

Many veterans express their despair at returning to an America which belittles their accomplishments, degrades their sacrifices, and simply tries to ignore their existence. In its desire to forget the bitter experiences of the Vietnam war, America seems intent on forgetting its warriors as well. Nowhere is this neglect of the veteran more evident than in the quality of our educational assistance program. There are a number of people in this country, some of whom unfortunately run the Veterans' Administration, who would have us believe that today's veteran receives benefits equal or even surpassing those granted to the returning veterans of World War II and Korea. The facts, however, dispute this interpretation. The VA's own study, conducted by the prestigious Educational Testing Service, concluded that "the real value of the educational allowance available to veterans of World War II was greater than the current allowance paid to veterans

of the Vietnam conflict when adjustments are made for the payment of tuition, less books and supplies." Although the VA disputed this conclusion, all other indications, including my own study, bear out its accuracy.

The real difference, of course, is that the World War II veteran received tuition payments and today's veteran does not. It does not come as any surprise to those of us with children in college that the costs of education are soaring. Tuition charges account for a large share of the rising educational expenses. The National League of Cities estimates that tuition payments alone have increased five times since the late 1940's. Where the World War II veteran did not have to worry to meet this essential payment, it has become almost an insurmountable obstacle to today's veteran. As the Carnegie Corporation concluded in its investigation of current veterans' benefits: "With the total average charges of private colleges over $4,500 and of public colleges over $2,700, according to the Office of Education, the veteran faces rough going in stretching benefits of $1,980." When I appeared before this subcommittee in September, I included in my testimony the estimated annual costs of attending five institutions of higher learning in the State of California. I should like to share these costs with you again today, and I ask unanimous consent these be included in the record and I will not read them.

Mr. EDWARDS. Without objection, they will be included.

[The document referred to follows:]

League of Cities estimates that tuition payments alone have increased five times since the late 1940's. Where the World War II veteran did not have to worry to meet this essential payment, it has become almost an insurmountable obstacle to today's veteran. As the Carnegie Corporation concluded in its investigation of current veterans' benefits: "With the total average charges of private colleges over $4,500 and of public colleges over $2,700, according to the Office of Education, the veteran faces rough going in stretching benefits of $1,980." When I appeared before this Subcommittee in September, I included in my testimony the estimated annual costs of attending five institutions of higher learning in the State of California. I should like to share these costs with you again today.

Stanford University:

Tuition	$3,135
Room and board	1,365–1,425
Books (average)	150
Fees (average)	21
Other personal expenses	450
Annual total	5,121–5,181

(Information provided by Robert E. Freelen, Director of Governmental Relations, July 3, 1973.)

University of Southern California:

Tuition	$2,700–$3,390
Fees	28–108
Books	140–320
Equipment	0–150
Room and board	1,322–0
Annual total	[1] 4,190–5,290

[1] No allowance computed for personal expenses.

(Information provided by President John R. Hubbard, June 22, 1973.)

California State College, Bakersfield, Calif:

State residents:	
Materials and fees	$177
I.D. card	2
Parking fee	20
Application fee	20
Facilities fee	20
Books	150
Annual total	[1]345
Out of State residents:	
Tuition	1,300
Other (see above)	345
Annual total	[1]1,645

[1] Estimated living expenses for a married student with one child, $4,200.

(Information supplied by J. Nolan Shaffer, Registrar, July 31, 1973.)

University of California:

Undergraduate tuition and fees:

School	Resident	Out of State
Berkeley	$637.50	$2,127.50
Davis	631.50	2,131.50
Irvine	621.00	2,121.00
Los Angeles	625.50	2,125.00
Riverside	645.00	2,145.00
San Diego	636.00	2,136.00
San Francisco	653.25	2,153.25
Santa Barbara	651.75	2,151.75
Santa Cruz	688.50	2,188.50

Books (all schools)	$180
Room and board:	
University housing	1,330–1,465
Married students	2,000
Miscellaneous living expenses	500
Annual total:	
Single resident	2,600–2,700
Married resident	3,300–3,400
Single nonresident	4,100–4,200
Married nonresident	4,780–4,870

I call the Subcommittee's attention to the dramatic variance in tuition charges, ranging from $3,135 at Stanford to no tuition at California State College in Bakersfield. By not covering tuition payments, we are effectively forcing our veterans to choose public universities within their own state, which are the only ones they can afford. I do not believe that this system is fair to either the veterans or to our colleges. It makes veterans shop for the cheapest education rather than the one which might afford them the best curriculum.

Mr. KETCHUM. I call the subcommittee's attention to the dramatic variance in tuition charges, ranging from $3,135 at Stanford to no tuition at California State College in Bakersfield. By not covering tuition payments, we are effectively forcing our veterans to choose public universities within their own State, which are the only ones they can afford. I do not believe that this system is fair to either the veterans or to our colleges. It makes veterans shop for the cheapest education rather than the one which might afford them the best curriculum for their interests. It also means that private colleges,

661 140

whose financial aid resources are limited, are de facto denied the special contributions which the veterans could bring to them.

Many veterans have written to me on just this point. Referring to current benefits, one veteran said, "Attendance at a private college or university—which may be desirable for someone requiring very specialized training—would be impossible." Another said, "V.A. benefits are used in a 'Catch-22' manner, which is borne out by the low numbers of Vets at Universities compared to the high number at Community Colleges where they are forced for financial reasons." Of course, tuition costs, while the largest expense to be borne by veterans in school, does not represent the full costs of a college education. To this we must add books, supplies, fees, food and housing and transportation. The total costs are often staggering. To help solve this problem, and to insure that today's veteran receives the benefits this Nation owes him, I introduced H.R. 9890 last August. My bill would provide for the payment of tuition, books, and fees up to $2,100 a year. I believe this is a livable figure, and allows the veteran considerably more choice in selecting a college in keeping with his desires and intellectual abilities. The crucial point is that tuition payments must be made for our veterans. These young men and women have served our Nation valiantly and well. In many cases, they have interrupted or postponed their education to do so. It is incumbent upon us to assist these veterans in the rebuilding of their lives. It is essential that we show them that someone does care about them, does appreciate their sacrifices and accomplishments and thanks God that they are home with us again. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I should like to share two articles with this committee. I recently had the honor of attending a ceremony, a Vietnam Veterans Day observance in Bakersfield, Calif. I would like to insert in your record a copy of a speech and poem delivered on that occasion, and I ask they be included.

Mr. EDWARDS. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[The documents referred to follow:]

VIETNAM VETERANS' DAY—BRIAN LYNCH

Today is supposed to be a day set aside to show appreciation to the Vietnam Era Veteran. That is nice, only it is eleven years too late. When I first heard about the Presidential proclamation, I wondered if Mr. Nixon is really sincere about his concern for us. Since then, I have come to the conclusion that he is not sincere . . . Nor is America.

(Tokenism) This expressed concern is another form of tokenism that has been shoved down our throats since the conflict started. The politicians only act when the pressure is on them. Why is it necessary to put pressure on these law makers? Why aren't they receptive to the needs of approximately 7.5 million Americans who have showed their love for America.

We who fought in your filthy war have been scorned, despised, and rejected by you, America. Is it easier to forget us and our needs? Right now, approximately 1 million vets are trying to get an education on inadequate funds, limited time, and an uncaring Veterans Administration.

How can a vet, or anyone else for that matter, live in today's society on $220 a month? No one! Almost every vet I know is forced to find a job outside school in order to get an education. We don't even qualify for most financial aid programs. Purdue University's Financial Aid officer thinks that the G.I. Education Benefits are a gift, and therefore, no one on the G.I. Bill is entitled to Financial Aid there. When are people in responsible positions going to accept their responsibility? We have been torn from our homes, our lives have been destroyed, our minds raped beyond repair from the lack of concern over our needs all because

you Americans wish to forget that the almighty U.S. of A. made a mistake in Vietnam.

When Johnny came marching home after WW II, he was given tuition, housing, and living expenses. When I came home and started my education, all I received is a bare minimum of living expenses, and that money was late getting to me. The VA must think that the vets can live on water and hope. Well, we can't, so why doesn't the VA get off its ass and do something for us Vietnam vets. Why is the VA so interested in WW I, WW II, and Korean Vets and not us. I feel that the VA is unwilling to accept that I have the same rights as those before me. For my input into my country, I deserve to be treated as a free person and not as a second-class citizen.

The best way to express this frustration is to quote a freckled-face medic standing in line at an employment office when he said, "Now I know how it feels to be a nigger." America, you can help us through increasing our educational, medical, and general benefits. The fact that we fought and died speaks loud enough for our love of our country, so please stop rejecting us.

I watched the Reasoner Report on TV the other night about two college presidents who survived the 60's. The president of Yale, I believe, stated that the frustrations of the 60's has gone underground. America, I wouldn't be surprised the next time it erupts, that those who are leading the mass strikes, will be the same people who are being lied to, given the shaft, and ignored by you, America, right now! Those I am speaking of are the Vietnam Veterans, and America, you did train us well at our appointed tasks.

Along with the VA, there is two national organizations that are supposed to work to make sure the Veterans get their cut of the pie. These two organizations do make token efforts to recruit new members among the Vietnam Veterans, but in reality, they are afraid and ashamed of us Veterans. These organizations are ashamed because they feel that we who bore the brunt of the battle didn't win our war. How in the hell can you win anything if some pantywaist is worrying over world opinion. Not even the WW II vet could have won their war under those conditions.

Fear is a nasty thing to try and overcome. They fear us because we are called "killers and dopers." Yes, some of us have the attitude and the conditioning to kill others, but how else can a person survive in a combat zone?

Given the frustrations of fighting an unwanted war and being in a country that has easy access to drugs, America helped create the environment for the abuse of drugs.

Why are drugs so publicized when the annual consumption of alcohol has probably made a lot of young people alcoholics, but to drink is to be accepted and to smoke is to be suppressed.

The easiest thing to do is to criticize anything. The hard thing is to offer an alternate plan for showing concern over the needs of the veteran. There are things that need to be done.

1. Congress should establish a separate VA especially for the 6–7.5 million Vietnam Era Veterans.

2. Terminate those in the VA who have shown their dislike for the Vietnam Vet.

3. Subsidize the colleges on the same fashion as A.D.A. to make these institutions actively recruit veterans there by helping them readjust to civilian life.

4. A positive commitment by the media to give us as much coverage as they have given the war.

In closing, a quote from a song by Stephen Wolf "America, where are you now * * * Don't you know we need you now!"

Mr. KETCHUM. While we may not enjoy hearing of this story, it is nevertheless filled with much truth, and I commend it for your study. I again thank you, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues on the subcommittee for this opportunity to appear before you.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Ketchum, the committee thanks you very much for the massive work which you have done assisting the committee for our early sponsorship of this important legislation and especially for the important documentation that you have supplied the committee. We are very grateful. I compliment you on your very large contribution.

Mr. Danielson.

Mr. DANIELSON. I would like to thank my colleague as well. He certainly has established a reputation here and in California for his work on education. Thank you.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mrs. Heckler.

Mrs. HECKLER. I would also like to congratulate my colleague and address one simple question to him. I think you have stated a position of sound leadership on this. I question, from a realistic point of view, the kind of support we might get on the minority side for the proposal. Do you have any idea what the support might be?

Mr. KETCHUM. Obviously, I have tested it with the Administration, and of course I am not here to rubber-stamp what any Administration wants me to do. As far as the minority members in the House of Representatives, I have little doubt they would support a proposition of this sort. Knowing me as you do, I am certainly not known as a big spender. This is one reason I think the Government has a real responsibility in, and we have to cut somewhere else to do the right thing here. I am sure the minority party will respond.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Wylie?

Mr. WYLIE. Thank you for an excellent presentation. On the first page of your statement you say that your own study indicates that the current allowances for Vietnam conflict veterans with adjustments are less than the benefits received by returning veterans of World War II and Korea. Have you projected that with the 13.6 percent increase in the GI bill that just passed the House?

Mr. KETCHUM. That did not include that. I had a bill before this subcommittee that would have increased them 10 percent, and I am delighted it was 13.6 percent, and I really don't feel that covers it.

The study that we did included asking these young veterans—and many of them are married—far more than when I came out of World War II or Korea—these young people submitted to me budgets, that is, exactly what they were receiving and how much it was costing them, and after looking at hundreds of them, I don't think they could afford to eat macaroni and go to school.

Mr. WYLIE. Is it your thought we should pay all of the expenses?

Mr. KETCHUM. It would not upset me at all. The original GI bill, as I recall it, after World War II was predicated on the fact it was an assistance program—work a while and go to school a while. The facts, I think, belie that from my observations. The University of California, at Santa Barbara, there is absolutely no way the veterans can work. There are no jobs. The jobs that are available are taken up by high school kids or young people who just dropped out of school and work full time. I think that is probably reflected in other universities around the United States, although I can't tell you what it is like in your State, but I can tell you what it is like in mine.

Mr. WYLIE. That may be a different problem. After World War II, I appreciated receiving the benefits of the GI bill, myself, because I never would have been able to get to Harvard Law School without it, but at the same time I had a job which supplemented my income and I had two loans I had to pay off after I got out of school so it didn't come anywhere near paying the costs of tuition and books and living expenses and room rent and so forth during that period of time, so

that was the real thrust of my question. Maybe it is more difficult to get work now and maybe there is a different test.

Mr. KETCHUM. I believe there is. There were so many things for us to come back to after World War II and Korea that don't exist in this post-Vietnam era. The people in this country hardly realized the war was going on and while these young people were giving up their lives to participate in that unpopular war, some other young people were going to school, getting their education, and are out competing for those jobs. These young folks are really in a disadvantageous position as far as competing is concerned.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank you.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Huber.

Mr. HUBER. Bill, I read this "Vietnam Veterans' Day" by Brian Lynch. Do you know the man?

Mr. KETCHUM. I sure do.

Mr. HUBER. Do you agree with what he says?

Mr. KETCHUM. I don't agree with everything he says but I think it should be included in the record so other people will know how these people feel. I don't know how other Vietnam veterans feel, but I understand their frustration, and this is what he is expressing.

Mr. HUBER. Bill, we have had much testimony here since I served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee—the American Legion, the VFW, organizations that represent thousands of young men, and I have had the opportunity to talk to some of the POW's. There is a great group of guys that have a right to say what this guy is saying. Was this man a POW?

Mr. KETCHUM. Of course not.

Mr. HUBER. To read his report you would think this young man went through the tortures with the rest of them. I could see the POW's coming up with something like this but the interesting thing is they don't take an attitude that a guy like Brian Lynch does. I read this as a certain type of individual that is not unfamiliar to us, and I am not sure that had I read this, I might not have objected to unanimous consent on that, but I would like to see some of the POW's stand up and say "America has deserted the veterans," because I don't believe we have. If we sat on this committee 15 or 16 months and had an attitude like that, we shouldn't be on this committee, and as I read the things he says: "We have been torn from our homes, our lives have been destroyed"—He is not dead, is he? Has his life been destroyed—his mind "raped beyond repair?"

Mr. KETCHUM. May I answer?

Mr. HUBER. I haven't finished talking. I also read the next thing about the great universities. I went to Yale. I happen to know a little about that university. 250 streakers 3 weeks ago on this old campus. I have talked to some of the men on campus who have seen the great professors leaving Yale, not staying there. I am not so sure Yale has such a great reputation at this point in time. I would counsel a veteran twice before suggesting he go to Yale University.

Bill, for all the time that I have spent on this committee, I can't accept the positions that Brian Lynch takes. It goes against all of the testimony of the veterans groups that have been before us. It goes against what the POW's are saying. I think this man ought to go see a psychiatrist. I wouldn't sit on this committee if I thought

Brian Lynch was justified in his position. I think he doesn't know what he is talking about, and I bet if we investigated him, we would find an awful lot more than meets the eye by this speech. These kind of things do not portray accurately the Veterans Affairs Committee, the concern of the Congress, and I don't believe they accurately represent the concern of the American people. I don't think the people in my district couldn't care less about Vietnam veterans. The people I have talked to in my district are concerned about the Vietnam veterans. They haven't had the news media to come out and play up the Brian Lynch's like he would get, but I believe the people back in my district want to do anything to help the Vietnam veterans and will vote for whatever is necessary to do so. I am sorry it has been put in the record. I don't think it reflects accurately the situation and I will be glad to hear your testimony now.

Mr. KETCHUM. I don't ask you to accept Brian Lynch's statement, but I do ask you to read it and try to crawl inside this kid and a lot of others, and I do not put him in the same category with some of the other individuals I have been associated with on some of our great university campuses at the end of the present Vietnam war. I don't have to agree with it but I do think I have to listen to it and I do think it reflects the attitudes of a substantial number of Vietnam veterans who feel they were not permitted to win a war, as we were in World War II and in some way in the Korean war, at least to come out with their heads up. Some of these young men don't feel the American public really gives a damn about them and believe me, the ceremony I attended there, we had 3 or 4 or 5 speakers, and we had them from all colorations, all political persuasions, and I add, the American Legion was there, but let me tell you, there were about 12 citizens there, and that shakes me up as a veteran of World War II and Korea. I don't have to agree with everything he says. I can understand his feelings. That is why I included this in here. I don't ask you to agree with it but to listen to one man's observation of what he felt.

Mr. HUBER. You said you met this man, knew this man?

Mr. KETCHUM. I attended this.

Mr. HUBER. Is he a constituent?

Mr. KETCHUM. Yes.

Mr. HUBER. Do you know what branch of the service he was in?

Mr. KETCHUM. I can't tell you.

Mr. HUBER. I would like to find out what branch of the service he was in and I would like to know a little about his record. I signed a letter today to a veteran of World War II who didn't like the treatment he got from the service and we checked him and got his record. This guy was court-martialed six times. I don't think he was actually on the base 10 percent of the time and yet he is complaining about the treatment he got from the Army. I think he is lucky he is out of the pokey as far as I am concerned, and we informed him so in the letter.

As a veteran myself, I sympathize with these guys in Vietnam. I don't buy what Mr. Brian Lynch has to say.

Mr. KETCHUM. I don't ask you to buy it. I ask you to try to understand it.

Mr. HUBER. I will try to understand it. I have talked to too many POW's.

Mr. KETCHUM. I am a veteran of World War II and the infantry. I take a back seat to nobody on my service and to what I believe about this country. I believe we owe some understanding to some of these young people who didn't understand why they were there or what they were doing, that is all.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Walsh.

Mr. WALSH. I want to extend my congratulations to Bill, too, for a very fine statement. I don't want to get into the colloquy that existed between you and he. I would rather let you fight.

Mr. HUBER. I don't think we are fighting.

Mr. WALSH. I think we have had some testimony before the committee that indicates the Vietnam veteran is angry. I agree with Bill we may not agree with it but we do have to listen to it.

I am also interested in the boldness with which you approach this bill. You have a little more courage than I do. I thought I was introducing a modest proposal which indicated a tuition grant up to $600, and was flabbergasted when the Veterans' Administration came in with an estimate of $400 million as the cost of this bill. If you multiply that out, your proposal comes to $1.7 billion and the initial estimate, after we challenged them on it, they cut it in two and brought the $47 million down to about $250,000, but even on that basis, your proposal would be about $900,000, so while I applaud your courage, and certainly agree with your reasoning on this and commend you for it, I think, in all candor, we have to realize we would never get anything through—I don't think we would, anyway, and that is why my proposal is a little more modest than yours. I will be glad to support any kind of tuition equalizer bill that comes out of this committee.

Mr. KETCHUM. I appreciate your comments and would certainly concur in what you are saying. I feel very strongly about this, and having seen some of the things we vote on around here and kick around 10 billion here and 20 billion here—this is the best $1 billion we can spend.

Mr. EDWARDS. California has never been known for having lack of courage in areas we believe in. Thank you very much for your very valuable testimony.

It is a pleasure to yield to the very distinguished colleague from the State of Massachusetts, who has rendered such a valuable service, not only in the House of Representatives and Congress generally, but especially on this committee, the lady, Mrs. Heckler.

Mrs. HECKLER. It is my privilege to present to you Dr. John Silber, the president of Boston University.

I requested this session of our hearings to include testimony from Dr. Silber, having been on his campus a number of occasions, having spoken to hundreds of his students and knowing of his expertise and depth in the field of education, I felt his testimony would be particularly valuable for our subcommittee.

Dr. Silber does not come to us with an eastern bias, as although, perhaps, I might be accused of that. He is the president of Boston University, has served for 15 years at the University of Texas. Therefore, he speaks not only from his background in public as well as private education. His own college career included post-graduate work at Northeastern University, Yale University, and appointment of several fellowship programs in England and Germany.

His outstanding teaching ability led him to the point of receipt of two esteemed awards. After 10 years of service in Texas, he has spent 31/2 years in Boston where he has gained a wide reputation. I feel we are very fortunate to have him in Massachusetts, and I must say his concern and his perspective will be very valuable for us on the subcommittee. It is my privilege to present to you Dr. Silber.

Mr. DANIELSON (presiding). Thank you very much, Mrs. Heckler, and the committee does welcome you, Dr. Silber.

You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN SILBER, PRESIDENT OF BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Mr. SILBER. I want to thank Congresswoman Heckler and the subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to testify on what seems to me to be a very important piece of legislation affecting an issue that has not merely substantial direct importance in this country but has great symbolic implications for the way in which the young and older generations are going to work together for the next generation in this country. I think we face a crisis in this country of generations and anything we can do to restore a feeling of mutual respect between these generations is well worth the price it takes. In this particular decade, we have an entirely different kind of problem with our veteran from the one we had following World War II. Following World War II, our veterans returned home as heroes to a hero's welcome and a grateful Nation who provided them enormous support—$75 a month as a living allowance and up to $500 a month as an allowance for tuition and books, which enabled them to go wherever they wanted to in higher education. If we want to know what that means, we have to consider the inflation that has taken place since 1946, on an average basis of 5-percent per year—we have to multiply, in this 28-year period, by a factor of 4, and we would find comparable support for the Vietnam veteran would require a $300 a month living allowance and a $2,000 tuition allowance per year. Obviously, we don't even pretend to provide this kind of support for the veterans of Vietnam.

I am not interested in making a case on the basis of the kind of testimony of a single individual that was of concern to Congressman Huber. What I am talking about is what the Nation owes literally million of veterans that served in Vietnam, what it owes the hundreds of thousands of veterans wounded there. What it owes the comrades of the over 50,000 veterans that died there. I am not interested in the fact some of these veterans are dissatisfied and profoundly alienated within our society. I think it would be a travesty upon justice, and our personal responsibility, if we let our dissatisfaction with those alienated few provide the basis for our neglecting the overwhelming majority that served brilliantly, courageously, and loyally in a war Congress itself could not make up its mind on. I think it is important for Congress to remember it did not see fit to declare war in Vietnam or order us out of Vietnam and the indecision that plagued Congress plagued so many of our citizens. We must not allow the literally hundreds of thousands of veterans of World War II and the millions who served in Vietnam to be neglected when they return home.

I think we must also remember the GI bill that followed the Second World War followed the most outstanding example of equal opportunity in the modern history of this country. The children of the working class, the children of the lower middle class, who never aspired to a college education, came to college and went on to professional schools, and the personnel of business, finance, the learned professions, and all walks of American life was infused with new and vigorous blood and the generation of persons now dominating higher education, dominating finance and business in this country, include a very large percentage of those who would never have been there without the GI bill. The GI bill broke up the old Caste system and was a triumph for democracy and equal opportunity. I would like to see the same thing happen again on behalf of the Vietnam veterans. It is easy to document the difference in the value of the graph today and the graph that was available to the World War II graduate.

In 1948, the living allowance for a single veteran was $75 a month. This amounted to 34.5 percent of the monthly earnings of the average American citizen and that percentage of the average income of the American citizen is the figure I want to focus your attention on. Because his tuition and book expenses were totally subsidized except for about $100 to $150 for those that went to Yale or Harvard, the average veteran was able to spend his entire living allowance for living expenses.

In 1973, however, we find the Vietnam veteran in a shockingly different situation. The single veteran now gets an allowance of $220 a month. Perhaps that has been raised 13 percent since I developed my analysis, but that won't substantially change the figures I want to present. This figure is almost precisely the same proportion of average earnings of the American citizen that obtained in 1948. But the figure is misleading. Out of this sum the Vietnam veteran must pay his tuition and fees and books. After paying these expenses the veteran has substantially less to live on than the 1948 living allowance.

I would like to present four examples to demonstrate how real and profound the differences are.

Situation one—A veteran attending the average public institution as an in-State resident pays $419 tuition and $216 for books. These costs prorated monthly throughout the academic year leave only $149.50 for living expenses. This is only 25 percent of the current monthly average wage of the American citizen. It is not the 34.5 percent any more, it is down to 25 percent.

Situation two—A veteran who attends the average public institution as a nonresident—the kid from Cleveland, for example, that wants to study a foreign language besides Spanish, French, or German and has to go out of the State to study it—those are the veterans that have to attend public institutions as a nonresident and they pay tuition on the average of $1,070 and the same $216 on the average for books. The remaining monthly allowance for living expenses is only $77, or a pathetic 12 percent of the average wage of a typical American citizen, only 12 percent, 12 cents on the dollar.

Situation three—A veteran who attends the average private institution pays tuition of $1,397 plus $216 for books. Prorating tuition and book expenses by the month throughout the academic year, he must borrow—he exhausts his living expenses on tuition and books alone.

and must borrow $25 each month to meet these payments and he has nothing left to live on. He has a negative living allowance.

Situation four—The veteran admitted to a Columbia or Yale or Stanford or Chicago or any one of the institutions charging the highest tuition must use his entire allowance, living allowance, for tuition alone, and must borrow in addition $180 each month merely to pay for the remainder of his tuition and books. He has nothing left to live on and faces rapidly mounting interest charges. He could exhaust the benefits available to him under loan benefits for higher education and still have nothing left to live on. A comparable veteran coming out of World War II could have gone to Harvard, at that time as expensive as any institution in the country, faced tuition charges of $600 for the year, pay $100 from his living allowance, and could save all of the rest for his living expense. That is the difference.

Of these veterans, the ones coming out of Vietnam, not even the one enrolled as an in-State resident in a public institution charging average tuition is so well off as the veteran of World War II attending Harvard. For the rest, the ingratitude of a grateful nation must be a bitter experience, something I, as a citizen and taxpayer am deeply ashamed of.

H.R. 11134 is an important though insufficient move toward remedying these drastic inequities and in remedying inequities in the treatment of Vietnam veterans as compared with those of World War II, and inequities in the treatment of Vietnam veterans depending on where they live—Texas, New York, Massachusetts, what they want to study, and whether they are able to study in a State or private institution.

H.R. 11134 is valuable in that it restores the separate tuition allowance of the original GI bill. I support this bill vigorously, no matter how great or how large the separate allowance is because at least it reestablishes this important principle—it establishes the independent allowance. By creating the separate allowance this bill focuses the attention of Congress on the fact that tuition charges alone in some public and in most private colleges and universities equal or exceed the total benefits provided Vietnam veterans.

I am cutting short and skimming through the testimony that I have written here, but I hope this committee will take time to examine some of the further examples I have given.

National access to higher education, though, it seems to me is important, that we now consider higher education in the United States from a national point of view. It is no longer adequate we regard this State by State, that we consider public higher education on one hand and private on the other. It is time we look now at our national resource—all of higher education in America—to see how it can be utilized most effectively and at the least cost.

When Representative Walsh referred to the high cost of this program, even under the modest stipulation of tuition allowance, he failed to mention another aspect of tuition cost.

If a veteran is sent, on the GI bill, to the University of Massachusetts, that veteran pays at the present time, only $300 in tuition, pays it out of his regular living allowance. The Federal taxpayer pays the veteran $300 which he uses to pay the university, and the Massachusetts taxpayer contributes an additional $2,450. Since every taxpayer of Massachusetts is also a Federal taxpayer, the cost to the Massachu-

setts taxpayer of sending a veteran to the University of Massachusetts under this bill is $2,750 per year.

If that student was able to go to Boston University under this bill, the Federal taxpayer would pay the maximum grant toward tuition of $1,019—under this bill he would be able to bring $1,019 with him—$300 out of his living costs and $419 out of the tuition and $600 in addition, as provided by this bill, for a total of $1,019. Who would finance the rest of this—not the Federal taxpayer or the taxpayers in the State of Massachusetts—it would be Boston, Mass. That facility that reduces the cost to the taxpayer is being ignored entirely—simply priced the veteran out of the private university and forced him to create additional pressures. These redundant facilities will themselves be vacant 10 years hence when the declining birth rate is felt appreciably at the level of universities in this country. This is terribly shortsighted and moreover, Congress, in trying to decide what the cost of this bill is, must not overlook the fact if they start making payments to the States and cities in revenue sharing the cost of supporting the State universities is going to be borne by the Federal taxpayer. If you want to understand the full cost, you must analyze it from the standpoint of both the State and Federal basis and find out what the true cost is. In most cases, it would be less expensive to the taxpayers of America, treated as they are, actual human beings, who pay both local, State, and National taxes, if Congress provided as much as $2,000 in benefits to the veteran for tuition in the private sector. It would still be less expensive in the State of Massachusetts—it would be $750 per student less expensive to provide even $2,000 in a tuition allowance to veterans, than to follow the present tactic of the residents of Massachusetts, through State taxes, paying the difference of the $2,450. An entirely new economic analysis is necessary for Congress to understand and accurately reflect the true cost of the present arrangement.

My basic position is there are no reasons I am aware of why the United States should show less gratitude to today's veterans than to yesterday's. If there is any argument for different treatment, it is that circumstances favor greater generosity today. In 1945 and 1946 veterans returned from victory to an expanding economy. Today's Vietnam veterans return unsure of victory to an uncertain economic prospect. The veteran making his reentry in 1973 and 1974 has a certain claim to greater support from the Nation.

The inequities that will continue if H.R. 11134 is passed in its present form lead me to the conclusion that further amendments should be considered to increase tuition grants and to encourage fuller utilization of the private sector in the education of our returning veterans. My concern to improve the benefits under this bill must not obscure, however, my wholehearted support of the bill in its present form. I agree with its intentions and unreservedly support its passage, and I am confident that everyone else in higher education in this country is of the same opinion. But I hope that Congress will either amend this bill or, in subsequent legislation, increase the educational benefits to veterans by emulating the high standards set by the original GI bill.

In closing, I should like to make a few comments concerning the testimony of Mr. Odell W. Vaughn of the Veterans' Administration in his opposition to this bill, as well as a suggestion for a new measure to combat abuses in proprietary institutions.

In his testimony before this committee, Mr. Odell W. Vaughn of the VA opposed H.R. 11134 because, among other reasons, of the experience of the VA with abuses when tuition payments have been made directly to institutions. Some schools, according to Mr. Vaughn, established a higher tuition for veterans and thereby enriched themselves; others have billed the VA for instruction not actually given. Many of these abuses, I believe, were reported in a very important report handled under the direction of Congressman Teague. No one countenances these kind of abuses and this bill, of course, prevents some of them. I think we must all acknowledge there is probably no way to prevent original sin by a legislative act, but the cost overruns likely to occur under this measure seem pitifully small compared to what the Government is regularly charged by great corporations. No one uses these as evidence that the Government stop buying ships and airplanes—and it is more money for each aircraft than we are talking about in this entire bill. No one should use the evidence of some minor culpability on the part of a few individuals who will take advantage of any bill, to have the Government stop buying ships and airplanes and no one should raise the specter of possible minor peculations against this modest improvement in benefits for the Vietnam veteran.

Mr. Vaughn several times complains about the administrative problems this measure would raise for the VA. If he would consider—as he ought—that his duty is to serve the veteran, he would remember that solving such problems is the only reason for the existence of his job. The VA exists for the veterans, the veteran does not exist for the VA.

Mr. Vaughn also makes the claim that should this bill be enacted, there would be a substantial escalation of tuition charges by many schools in the private sector. If he is talking about private colleges and universities as opposed to proprietary institutions, his suspicions are ill-founded. We in the private sector are already priced at the limits of the market, facing competition from the State system that would be unfair in ordinary business life. The average tuition in the private sector in the United States today is $1,997, almost $2,000, so even if the tuition grant I advocate of $2,000 a year were put in this bill, it would be no more than the average tuition in average higher education at the present time, and as a matter of fact, the $600 is lower than private tuition in any reputable and accredited school, private institution, or college of which I am aware. I don't think we need to worry about that. The law can prohibit the use of veterans' benefits at institutions charging differential rates of tuition for veterans and nonveterans, and it undoubtedly should.

What about the veteran who is tempted by a low benefit to attend an inadequate or possibly fraudulent for-profit school needs better protection than the law now gives. Many proprietary schools in the country do a distinguished job of training and it is clearly right that veterans' benefits should go to cover the cost of that education. But it is clear that the availability of Government funding is stimulating a considerable amount of expansion of this kind of school of a particularly sleazy quality. A recent series in the Boston Globe, based on aggressive reporting by that paper's Spotlight Team, highlighted the many abuses that are growing in this area. The Congress could cure a major part of this problem by simply requiring that any proprietary school satisfy the State's 1202 Commission of its bona fides. The 1202 Com-

missions have been set up pursuant to the Higher Education Act of 1972, and they include representatives from the State, independent, and proprietary sectors of education. The present provision, by which the Administrator may refuse further enrollments in a nonaccredited proprietary school with more than 85 percent veteran enrollment, has already proved inadequate.

What I would suggest is that this committee make use of the 1202 Commission and simply modify the rules relating to the Commission's awarding of veterans benefits to these schools to see to it that abuses in this area are contained, to a limited and reasonable level.

Mr. DANIELSON [presiding]. Thank you, Dr. Silber. Do you have your testimony in some type of written form? I appreciate the fact that you have compressed it. I, apparently, didn't get a copy. If there is no objection——

Ms. HECKLER. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Silber's written original testimony be inserted in the record.

Mr. DANIELSON. Without objection, so ordered. That will give us the benefits of the portions you skimmed over in the permanent record.

[The document referred to follows:]

STATEMENT OF JOHN R. SILBER, PRESIDENT, BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Education has long been recognized as the key to opportunity in this society. The G.I. Bills have been significant milestones on the road to equal opportunity in higher education. The G.I. Bill following World War II brought children of the lower middle and working classes into our colleges and universities and out into business, finance and the learned professions in unprecedented numbers. It made good the claims of upward mobility and opportunity for which this country is famous and justly proud.

It is hard to be indifferent about any increase, however modest, in the support of higher education for veterans. Candor compels me, nevertheless, to point out that if veterans of Vietnam are to be given educational opportunities remotely comparable to those extended the veterans of World War II, Congress must revise H.R. 11134 to reflect what thirty years of inflation have done to the cost of higher education in general and to tuition charges in the so-called private sector of higher education in particular.

The first G.I. Bill sent 2.2 million veterans to college by paying tuition charges in addition to a substantial living allowance for each enrolled veteran. Following World War II a grateful nation did not require the veteran to educate himself as cheaply as possible at the smallest cost to the federal government. Instead, he was given a tuition allowance of $500 to spend at any reputable institution to which he was admitted. If he attended a tuition-free college such as City College of New York, he was still allowed $10 a month for tuition. If he chose to attend a college on the quarter system and therefore incurred higher tuition charges per calendar year, the government adjusted his maximum grant accordingly. If he chose a Harvard or Yale, he needed no more than $100–$150 per year to pay his tuition. The provisions of the original G.I. Bill were remarkably generous.

But our gratitude and generosity to veterans have been turned to meanness and ingratitude by the inflation of the past thirty years. Congress has made small adjustments in educational benefits for veterans, but it has not revised current benefits sufficiently to restore comparable values.

The original program allowed a maximum payment of $500 for tuition and books. In 1948 the average tuition charged at public institutions was $140, and the average student spent $50 on books and supplies. The veteran who enrolled in a public institution received in effect a full-tuition scholarship. The average tuition in private colleges and universities was $396. After the veteran in a private school added in his books and supplies, he also received typically a full-tuition scholarship. He was even well subsidized at the most expensive institutions. In 1948 the tuition charge at the University of Chicago was $495 a year,

and at Stanford, $499.50. The veteran needed only $45–$50 a year in addition to buy his books. At Yale or Harvard, where tuition was then $600 per year, the veteran needed no more than an extra $100–$150 a year. The intent and effect of the Bill was perfectly clear. A veteran from the poorest family was not barred by financial considerations from education at the finest institutions in America. Upward mobility on the basis of competence and ambition was made possible.

In 1948 the living allowance for a single veteran was $75 a month. This amounted to 34.5 per cent of the monthly earnings of the average American. Because his tuition and book expenses were totally subsidized except for about $100–$150 at the most expensive and prestigious schools, the average veteran was able to spend his entire living allowance for living expenses. In 1973, however, we find the Vietnam veteran in a shockingly different situation. The single veteran now gets an allowance of $220 a month. This figure is almost precisely the same proportion of average earnings as in 1948. But the figure is misleading. Out of this sum the Vietnam veteran must pay his tuition and fees and books. After paying these expenses the veteran has substantially less to live on than the 1948 living allowance.

Consider four typical cases:

I. A veteran attending the average public institution as an in-state resident pays $419 tuition and $216 for books. These costs prorated monthly leave only $149.50 for living expenses. This is only 23 per cent of the current monthly average wage.

II. A veteran who attends the average public institution as a non-resident pays tuition of $1,070 and the same $216 for books. The remaining monthly allowance for living expenses is only $77, or a pathetic 12 per cent of the average wage.

III. The veteran who attends the average private institution pays tuition of $1,997 plus $216 for books. Prorating tuition and book expenses by the month throughout the academic year, he must borrow $25 each month to meet these payments, and he has nothing left to live on.

IV. And the veteran admitted to a Columbia or Yale or Stanford or Chicago or any one of the institutions charging the highest tuition must use his entire allowance and borrow in addition $180 each month merely to pay for tuition and books. He has nothing left to live on and faces rapidly mounting interest charges.

Of these veterans, not even the one enrolled as an in-state resident in a public institution charging average tuition is so well off as the veteran of World War II attending Harvard. For the rest, the ingratitude of a "grateful nation" must be a bitter experience.

H.R. 11134 is an important though insufficient move toward remedying these drastic inequities—inequities in the treatment of Vietnam veterans as compared with those of World War II, and inequities in the treatment of Vietnam veterans depending on where they live, what they study, and whether they study in state or private institutions.

H.R. 11124 is valuable in that it restores the separate tuition allowance of the original G.I. bill. By creating the separate allowance this bill focuses the attention of Congress on the fact that tuition charges alone in some public and in most private colleges and universities equal or exceed the total benefits provided Vietnam veterans.

The maximum tuition payment allowed under H.R. 11134 of $1,019 is generous only when compared to the immediate past. Better than nothing, it is scarcely adequate to the needs of the present. $419 is the median tuition charged by state institutions to their own residents. State institutions generally charge non-residents out-of-state tuition that on the average is two and one-half times the in-state rate. If we could treat higher education in the United States on a localized basis, this would pose no major problem. But it has become increasingly clear that we must regard higher education as a national system, since there are many states in which a veteran is simply unable to be educated along the lines of his own interest at institutions within his state. In Nevada, for example, the curriculum of the state university is limited in important ways. As a further illustration, throughout the nation opportunities in veterinary medicine are severely limited; in the six New England states there is no school of veterinary medicine. No one can make sense of the problems of higher education or find means of providing adequate educational opportunity to our veterans unless he considers the educational resources of the nation, both state and private, as a single, comprehensive system. It is in the national interest to treat them as a single system and to facilitate its most rational and effective development and utilization. Just as veterans serve not merely their state but their

entire nation, they should have access to the educational resources of their nation and not be restricted for financial reasons to those of their individual state or for financial reasons be denied access to private higher education.

The present formula of H.R. 11134 does not facilitate national access, though it is clear a major step toward this goal. It will equalize the cost of education in state schools for veterans in California and veterans in New York by providing no increase in benefits for California veterans while increasing substantially the benefits available to New York veterans. At the same time it will not increase substantially the opportunity for veterans in either state to attend institutions in the private sector.

Representative Walsh has correctly observed that H.R. 11134 will help to equalize access to higher education for New York veterans as compared with veterans from Texas or California, where tuition in the state-supported sector is exceedingly low. But this bill does very little to facilitate access to private universities and colleges in New York, California, Texas, or anywhere else in the nation. In New York City a veteran attending the City University pays no tuition. His living allowance is therefore $1,764. A veteran attending Columbia University pays $3,370 in tuition. After paying for tuition and books he has nothing left for living expenses and incurs a debt of $1,606. The differential in cost to the veteran at Columbia and at City University is $3,370—the amount of tuition at Columbia. H.R. 11134 does not speak significantly to the problem of opening the resources of private higher education to the Vietnam veterans as they were opened to the veteran of World War II. These examples could be multiplied indefinitely, but the import is clear: no veteran dependent upon his G.I. benefit can afford to attend a university in the private sector.

There are those who would argue that if the American taxpayer is going to educate the veteran, he should do it in the low-cost state sector where the drain on the taxpayer will be less. This is a fallacious notion. The assumption that veterans ought to be educated in "low-cost" public institutions rather than "high-cost" private ones involves two major errors. The first of these is that there is any such thing as private education. All colleges and universities operate toward one end—the education of the public. A so-called private university is no more private than any public utility. Like them, it serves nothing but the public. Some universities are taxpayer-subsidized; other universities are subsidized by private philanthropy. In terms of their purpose and function, however, they are equally public. Until we clearly understand this, there is little hope of our understanding the financial difficulties now affecting all institutions of higher education.

It is a second mistake to suppose that "public," or more precisely, state-supported education costs less than "private," or more precisely, independent education. It is a mistake to confuse the *cost* of education with the *price* that is charged the student. Education of comparable quality costs comparable sums. The state can buy neither services nor products cheaper than its citizens. Whatever educational services it delivers through its own institutions will be paid for at market price by the taxpayer. This fact is masked by the use of such language as "free public education." It is a fact that no education is free, though not everyone pays.

The annual cost per student of operating the University of Massachusetts is $2,750. Now suppose that a veteran takes his educational benefit to the University of Massachusetts where tuition is $300 a year. The federal taxpayer pays the veteran $300 which he uses to pay the University, and the Massachusetts taxpayer contributes an additional $2,450. Since every taxpayer of Massachusetts is also a federal taxpayer, the cost to the Massachusetts taxpayer of sending a veteran to the University of Massachusetts under this bill is $2,750 per year.

Let us suppose that the veteran attends Boston University under this bill. The federal taxpayer will pay the maximum grant toward tuition of $1,019. The taxpayer of Massachusetts will pay nothing. The total cost to all taxpayers cannot exceed $1,019.

If higher education in the United States were considered as a national system, H.R. 11134 could be amended to allow tuition benefits up to $2,750 per year for veterans attending private universities and colleges, without exceeding the cost presently paid by taxpayers to educate the veteran at the state university. By failing to consider public and private institutions as a part of a single, general system, we make egregious errors in the assessment of costs. Moreover, we jeopardize the existence of private higher education and its current subsidy of the education of the public. The government could prudently subsidize private higher

education for veterans in any state of the Union up to $2,000 a year at substantially lower cost than it can subsidize veterans' education in the public sector at $419. This analysis presupposes our recognition of the total obligation of taxpayers both as federal taxpayers and as taxpayers of their states.

Without cost to the taxpayer private universities and colleges contribute billions of dollars each year to the education of the public. Instead of enabling the veteran to utilize these facilities by providing tuition grants up to $2,000 a year, H.R. 11134, by its severely limited tuition benefit, will continue to force veterans into the state systems and create further pressure for the pointless duplication of educational facilities at enormous cost to the taxpayers of the individual states. A more sophisticated economic analysis than has heretofore been made will show that it is far cheaper to enable the veteran to utilize vacant spaces in the private sector than to increase the demand for constructing redundant facilities in the public sector. These redundant facilities in ten years will themselves be vacant as the college-age population declines. These redundant facilities may seem to members of the Congress to be less expensive because they are paid for by taxpayers of the individual states. If the members of Congress will note the intensified demand for revenue-sharing, they will see that the cost to the federal government cannot be so neatly isolated from the cost to the state government. In an age of declining enrollments, there is unused capacity in the private sector. By educating Vietnam veterans in that sector, Congress can remove the necessity for costly and wasteful state expansion. The saving may first be felt by the state taxpayer, but by reducing the need for increased revenue-sharing, it will also be felt by the federal taxpayer.

There is in my opinion no conceivable reason why the nation should show less gratitude to today's veterans than to yesterday's. If there is any argument for different treatment, it is that circumstances favor greater generosity today. In 1945 and 1946 veterans returned from victory to an expanding economy. Today, Vietnam veterans return unsure of victory to an uncertain economic prospect. The veteran making his re-entry in 1973 and 1974 has a certain claim to greater support from the nation.

The inequities that will continue if H.R. 11134 is passed in its present form lead to the conclusion that further amendments should be considered to increase tuition grants and to encourage fuller utilization of the private sector in the education of our returning veterans. My concern to improve the benefits under this bill must not obscure, however, my wholehearted support of the bill in its present form. I agree with its intentions and unreservedly support its passage, and I am confident that everyone else in higher education in this country is of the same opinion. But I hope that Congress will either amend this bill or, in subsequent legislation, increase the educational benefits to veterans by emulating the high standards set by the original G.I. Bill.

In closing, I should like to append comments concerning the testimony of Mr. Odell W. Vaughn of the Veterans Administration in his opposition to this bill, as well as a suggestion for a new measure to combat abuses in proprietary institutions.

COMMENTS ON TESTIMONY BY MR. ODELL W. VAUGHN OF THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

APPENDIX A

In his testimony before this committee, Mr. Odell W. Vaughn of the VA opposed H.R. 11134 because, among other reasons, of the experience of the VA with abuses when tuition payments have been made directly to institutions. Some schools, according to Mr. Vaughn, established a higher tuition for veterans and thereby enriched themselves; others have billed the VA for instruction not actually given. There are two short answers to these objections. The first is that no legislative body has yet written a law that no one has wanted to break. Administrative systems must always be devised to prevent abuses. H.R. 11134 does not contemplate making any direct payments to institutions. These abuses rightly objected to by Mr. Vaughn are simply not relevant to the program. One possible abuse he cites is relevant: that a veteran might enroll in a school and withdraw early enough to get a refund. Under present VA practices, the refund would be made to the veteran, who would thus illegitimately enrich himself. The remedy is obvious: the VA should require that any refund be made directly to it. If the VA believes that present law prevents such a requirement, it should suggest remedial legislation to the Congress, preferably at the hearings being

conducted on this bill by this Committee. This is one of the purposes of these hearings, as Mr. Vaughn well knows. And should the Congress ever for any reason want to reinstitute direct payments, it would be easy enough to devise remedial provisions; schools should be explicitly forbidden to charge higher tuition to veterans. As to the possibility that some unscrupulous institution will pad its bills to the VA, there is probably no way to prevent original sin by a legislative act, but the cost overruns likely to occur here seem pitifully small compared to those that the government is regularly charged by great corporations. No one uses these as evidence that the government stop buying ships and airplanes, and no one should raise the spectre of possible minor peculations against this modest improvement in benefits for the Vietnam veteran.

Mr. Vaughn several times complains about the administrative problems this measure would raise for the VA. If he would consider—as he ought—that his duty is to serve the veteran, he would remember that solving such problems is the only reason for the existence of his job. The VA exists for the veteran, not vice versa.

Mr. Vaughn also makes the claim that should H.R. 11131 be enacted, there would be a substantial escalation of tuition charges by many schools in the private sector. If he is talking about private colleges and universities, his suspicions are ill-founded. We in the private sector are already priced at the limits of the market, facing competition from the state system that would be unfair in ordinary business life. Mr. Vaughn suggests that tuition charges in the private sector always rise to the maximum benefit allowed by the VA. But the private colleges and universities are already two or three times greater than the maximum benefit proposed in this legislation; it allows a maximum of $1,019, and tuition at Boston University, for example, next year will be $2,890. And there is no reason why he should single out private colleges; this bill would enable public colleges similarly to raise tuition charges up to maximum, and it is in the public sector that 81% of the veterans now attend. The law can prohibit the use of veterans' benefit at institutions charging differential rates of tuition for veterans and non-veterans.

A Suggestion for Combating Abuses in Proprietary Schools

APPENDIX B

The veteran who is tempted by a low benefit to attend an inadequate or possibly fraudulent for-profit school needs better protection than the law now gives. Many proprietary schools in the country do a distinguished job of training, and it is clearly right that veterans' benefits should go to cover the cost of that education. But it is clear that the availability of government funding is stimulating a considerable amount of expansion of this kind of school of a particularly sleazy quality. A recent series in *The Boston Globe*, based on aggressive reporting by that paper's Spotlight Team, highlighted the many abuses that are growing in this area. The Congress could cure a major part of this problem by simply requiring that any proprietary school satisfy the state's "1202 Commission" of its bona fides. The 1202 Commissions have been set up pursuant to the Higher Education Act of 1972, and they include representatives from the state, independent and proprietary sectors of education. The present provision, by which the Administrator may refuse further enrollments in a non-accredited proprietary school with more than 85% veteran enrollment, has already proved inadequate.

Mr. Danielson. I would like to ask you for your recommendations in one context only. Let's forget the public institutions of higher learning and think only about the private sector. Let's suppose you have A, B, and C, one having a tuition of $2,000, one having a tuition of $2,500 and one having a tuition of $3,000. Obviously, the student—let's assume he must opt for one of these three. Do you feel there should be uniformity in tuition allowance or should the VA, or our law contemplate, whatever he wants, whatever his school chart is, he gets? I would like you to comment on that.

Mr. Silber. I think, from the veteran's point of view, it would be highly desirable to have the tuition set at whatever the tuition of the school is, and let the veteran be able to pay that amount if he is ad-

GPO
156

mitted to the school. On the other hand, in the world of compromise in which we must live, politically I would be quite willing to accept, say, a $2,000 or $2,500 upper limit, a limit that is consistent with the average in the private sector simply to avoid the abuses Congressman Teague revealed of some schools deliberately kicking the tuition higher in order to have the benefit of the veterans' payments. There is a compromise—from the veterans' standpoint, I think it should be a full tuition grant. From the standpoint of trying to protect against artificially inflating it, it might be wiser to have some limit or say the amount the veteran can pay will be based on the tuition in that school effective 1970—whatever it was in 1970.

Mr. DANIELSON. In other words, taking an older reference point in order to avoid artificial inflation?

Mr. SILBER. Right.

Mr. DANIELSON. I take it then, aside from the philosophical idea, you recognize in the real world in which we live it might be necessary to have some kind of a ceiling?

Mr. SILBER. Yes, I do.

Mr. DANIELSON. But arrived at in a responsible manner that recognizes, again, the real facts of life on tuition?

Mr. SILBER. Yes, and I would say anything less than $2,000 doesn't come close to making the benefit to the veteran comparable to what it was at the end of World War II.

Mr. DANIELSON. I understand that. I think you made your point well. I am thinking of a very pragmatic situation, and that is—really two points—the one you mentioned about the induced inflation on charges which could result under such a situation, and the very practical point, if student A receives $2,000, why should not Student B receive $2,000 for the same purpose or the same situation, and I think your suggestion of striking an average or going back to a reference point like we use as a cost of living index, for example, might have real validity as one of the factors I think this committee will have to consider in drafting this bill. For your own comfort, if any, customarily none of the bills introduced are ever passed by the committee. They are going to go through a synthesis here. Heaven knows what the ultimate bill will be. I think something will come out of the committee.

Mr. Brinkley.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Silber, I was very impressed with your delivery and style and facts. We welcome you to the committee and I want to tell you I support your position.

I wanted to explore just for a moment with you the use of some of your terminology. For example, you refer to the "ingratitude of the American people" and say you are "deeply ashamed of that." I wonder if that is an accurate emotion. In our section of the country, I don't think we are ungrateful. I was glad to hear you say, through the media, the Boston Globe, that the American people might be better educated as to the facts. I am wondering if, when you say, "Congress never made up its mind in the Vietnam War," perhaps the fact we didn't make up our minds one way, that is by a declaration of war, doesn't preclude our minds having been made up—having made up our minds through the various times, on appropriations bills—the fact is we made a decision and finally we changed that decision under the

direction of the executive branch. Possibly it was the conduct of the leadership of the executive branch, that kept us in a quandary. We won't debate that point.

I was interested to hear your evaluation of the remarks of Mr. Vaughn because the leadership of the executive branch is really important—the people, the Congress, with the executive branch. I just want to assure you and reassure you that Congress is the closest branch to the people and we are going to be responsive. We are going to rectify some of these omissions to try to express our gratitude. There is a quote that says, "Good words will gain you honor in the marketplace, but good deeds will gain you friends among men." I think that is what you are saying. I hope so. I want to say again, we support your position. I think you made a very good statement.

Mr. SILBER. Thank you.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Wylie.

Mr. WYLIE. Thank you, Mr. Silber, for a very interesting and informative presentation, extremely and eloquently presented.

In the beginning of your testimony, you said something about a $100 a month tuition allowance during World War II. You didn't mean a month, did you?

Mr. SILBER. If I said that, I was speaking in error. I meant $500 tuition per academic year.

Mr. WYLIE. That does make a difference.

Mr. SILBER. All of the numbers I presented in my written testimony are calculated on the direct interpretation.

Mr. WYLIE. You mentioned, you suggested a figure of $2,000 a year grant for every student, for every G.I. who enters college—is that your figure?

Mr. SILBER. No. My view was it would be desirable to have a tuition grant of up to $2,000 and at that level it would be substantially less expensive to the American taxpayer, recognized as both a taxpayer in the State and to the Federal Government than the present system which artifically forces the student into the public sector and the taxpayer of the State is in the redundant position.

Mr. WYLIE. Would that go to every student or person who qualifies under the G.I. bill?

Mr. SILBER. No. If a student could fulfill his needs in A, in Congressman Teague's State, the greatest university is by all odds, the University of Texas at Austin—it would be quite natural for a veteran in that State to choose the University of Texas at Austin. He couldn't find a better law school to attend. Why should he go elsewhere? It is a university comparable to the best in the Nation. That person can go to the University of Texas for around $250, $300 a year tuition and presumably that is all he would be given, but if he were admitted to Harvard or Stanford or the University of Chicago or Boston University, then I would advocate his being given a tuition allowance of up to $2,000 toward the tuition in those universities.

Mr. WYLIE. What is the tuition per year at Harvard?

Mr. SILBER. About $3,200 for next year.

Mr. WYLIE. During World War II, that was about $600 a year I think you mentioned in here?

Mr. SILBER. $600 in 1946. In 1944 and 1945 it was $500, but by the time the veteran got back and got in it was about $600.

Mr. WYLIE. Well, I don't know—I am trying to search here and trying to find out what is fair and what figure we should use, and then how it should be administered. Should every veteran who qualifies under the GI bill be given the same amount or just the amount of his tuition payments, or what? Do you think there would be the likelihood some of the universities might increase their tuition costs to veterans if they knew that it was all going to be paid up to $2,000? What I am suggesting is I think there might have been some of that after World War II.

Mr. SILBER. But they weren't getting the tuition costs. Tuition is a price. The cost of education must never be confused with the price being charged the student in tuition. Tuition is a price measure. The cost is what is actually paid by the university to educate that student and the cost of the public sector has never been—is roughly the same. The cost of education at the University of Massachusetts, as I mentioned earlier, is $2,750, $1,000 per student finance charges on the debentures.

Mr. WYLIE. You are not suggesting they be equalized, though?

Mr. SILBER. What I am suggesting is the costs are already equalized. All we are talking about now is the price. I am not suggesting the prices should be equalized because the taxpayer has already subsidized it.

Mr. WYLIE. That is the point I want to make.

Mr. SILBER. The way to protect the concern you have in mind is perhaps designate a certain date, that under no circumstances would the Veterans' Administration pay more than the tuition charged by the university as of September 1972, or September 1973, and in no case would they pay more in a tuition allowance than say $2,000, which is the average at the present time in the public sector. This way, I think, you could protect yourself against any efforts to have excess profits through the raising of tuition.

Mr. WYLIE. OK. I think you have made a valid contribution right there. I think that is all I have.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Huber.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to have some priorities in veterans' awards. I think POW's, and deceased service-connected should get top priority on funds. Next, the wounded. Eventually we get to somebody who is in the rear ranks, safe and secure, who never really did very much.

I think in terms of World War II—I don't know what the average term of service was in World War II—it was considerably longer than Vietnam, I am sure—the draftee in World War II, drafted in 1940, got out in 5 years. I think the average time of serving the country in World War II was considerably longer than Vietnam in terms of the amount of years.

Also somewhere—it doesn't sound very good, I guess, anymore, but there ought to be some justification for a man serving his country—maybe the right to enjoy the magnificent freedom we have in this country, without saying—"what are we going to get back." I am not talking about the guy who was shot. I was in the research development program, Ordinance Department—big deal. I never felt my country owed me very much.

I listened with a great deal of interest to these positions of everybody on what the country owes them. It would be nice if somebody said, "what do we owe the country?" I feel strongly about that. I don't know—this Brian Lynch, was he a rear ranker? It would be interesting to see what his record is.

We haven't forgotten the veterans, and I don't think I voted against any veterans' bills that came out of this committee. I feel a great rapport with them. The greatest rapport is for the deceased POW's. When you get down to the rear rankers who never left this country, I am not so sure they ought to have a Harvard or Yale education.

We have wealthy kids, and those who didn't have much money. In other words, if you are hard pressed for funds, you could go to Yale and get a fine education—you might have to work a little. I don't recall any of my classmates dropping dead for lack of funds. For those who were really concerned about an education, the fact they didn't have enough money for tuition didn't deter them. Now, it is almost as if they are saying that if we don't give them sufficient funds, there is no way they can get an education. I don't think that is true. There are a lot of ways people can get an education without coming in and saying, look, I served in the Army of the United States and therefore I am entitled to a free education. For the POW's or the deceased, or the families of the deceased—first class, whatever. By the time we get down to the rear rankers who never left this country, I might hope to send them to Harvard because it might teach them a lesson, but I wouldn't send them to Yale. I have great reservations on this subject. Just because they were in the Army doesn't necessarily, in my opinion, entitle them to all kinds of unlimited preferences unless they were in that limited category.

Mr. DANIELSON. Thank you.

Mr. Walsh?

Mr. WALSH. My colleague from Michigan, there is an old, old saying someplace—they also serve who only stand and wait, and we might remember that.

Dr. Silber, we have had some stimulating testimony before this committee. I think yours is probably one of the most thought provoking I have heard presented, and I do sincerely congratulate you on the thought and work that went into what you have presented here today.

I do have some comments about some of the things. I think one of the factors that has been brought out here is many of the students leaving college today are averaging something over $5,000 in debt. It seems to me I have heard that figure. Maybe you can verify that. I realize the sum in this bill is insufficient. We have to be realistic and have to, I think, get what we can. I was delighted to hear your criticism of the Veterans' Administration. I share your feelings about the Veterans' Administration and I think many of the objections they raised in their testimony about the difficulties they have experienced with some of the previous GI bills, and this one if it goes through, is merely an indication that they are not equipped to handle some of the problems today, and maybe a reorganization of that Administration is necessary. I would certainly vote for something like that.

One of the things that you mentioned hits me very, very closely. I served as a member of the board of trustees, Syracuse University, for 8 years, and now am a member of the trustees 2-year woman's college. When I first went on the woman's college, I think it was in 1969, we

were talking about expanding the facilities, new dormitories—lo and behold, 2 or 3 years after that the situation turned around completely and there was no need to expand the dormitory facilities. All of a sudden we have a lot of empty beds and don't have students to put in them.

The thing that struck me—I heard your testimony this morning—we are spending a lot of money in expanding the State University in New York, and we don't think we have to take a back seat to any other State for that system—we have come into the field in recent years, building with 1960 and 1970 dollars, and the sad part is, though, as we expand this public university system, we are also faced with the possible closing this year of seven private colleges, and it just doesn't make sense to me to see this great expansion of public university system when we have great colleges like Eisenhower College, fine private institution, faced with the possibility of closing, so your testimony that the taxpayer is paying a great deal of the cost of this thing is very, very true.

The other point I do want to make, and I think we have had some testimony before us so far, is the bugaboo about tuition going up if this bill is passed. Isn't it a fact tuition is going to go up anyway? I don't think, because of this bill, we have to face reality, wages are going to go up, other costs are going to go up, and I think we had testimony last week—I believe it is Boston University is proposing a $150 tuition increase. I don't know what some of the others are doing but it seems to me tuition is inevitably going up whether or not this bill is passed.

I notice that you indicated that we have reached the limit in tuition costs, but I don't think we have. I would like to hear your comments.

Mr. SILVER. What I said was we had reached the limits of the market. We are now competing with the State sector on a 10 to 1 ratio. I do agree with you, inflation is going to effect higher education just as it effects every other aspect of life and consequently tuition will raise proportionate to inflation. I don't think it will rise beyond it because we have these extraordinary market factors. A 10 to 1 price differential between the public and private sector is a strong dabbling influence on any increase not absolutely essential.

The other thing to note is that the increase in the average cost of education in the United States is almost directly that factor of 4 over the last 28 years. It has gone up right with the general pattern of inflation. It hasn't gone substantially beyond it but the trouble is the problems of magnitude.

Mr. DANIELSON. Could I interrupt just a moment—would the gentleman yield for just a moment?

I understand one of our local television channels, Channel 7, would like permission to shoot some silent film. Would there be any objection on the part of any of the members of the committee?

Apparently, there is none. Why don't you tell them to come in and shoot.

Mr. WALSH. Just one other comment, Dr. Silber, you hinted at in your testimony. It seems to me that one of the real discriminations suffered by the Vietnam veteran because he is forced to choose some of the public institutions is the fact there will be programmatic differences between the public institutions and the private—I don't mean to indicate the quality of the education is any less, but certainly the choice of programs is much greater in a private institution. This week,

Syracuse University observed—one of the great schools in this whole field—and the mere fact Syracuse University now charges a tuition of $3,000 precludes many of the students from attending that type of school and getting that type of training, and there is no comparable program in the public sector. I think this is extremely important lack the Vietnam veteran has. He doesn't have that choice of program which the World War II and Korean veterans have.

Mr. STARK. I think that point is very well taken. There is one point which Congressman Huber made, which I would like to respond to. I think it is the case for many soldiers and sailors and members of the Marine Corps, that they are not given the option of deciding where they are going to serve and many stay behind the lines and stay at home who continually, particularly in World War II and even also in Vietnam, kept asking for overseas and front line assignments.

One of the veterans of World War II who stayed at home much against his own personal preference, and the rear support was something on the order of 10 to 11 to 1, and that, in Vietnam, it was perhaps slightly higher than that, but approximately the same. Back-up personnel make effective war machine possible by staying at home, supplying the guns for the function. Wouldn't we then treat as second class citizens soldiers whose contribution to the service is just as great as those on the front lines? I think, what your real answer to this concern is, and I agree with all of your priorities, concern for the families and children of those killed—front line experience and the kind of psychological shock that goes with that—all of those priorities I can share, and I certainly can't argue with your point about the fact the war ought to be a function of the term of service. If a man has been a veteran for 5 years, why shouldn't he have a longer period of educational support than if he only served 6 months or 1 year—I don't have a quarrel with any of those things. I think the only way your concern would be fully satisfied would be if we finally developed a year or two of national service, why we expected every citizen to make a contribution to his country, and didn't talk about a high salary of remuneration, but for every man. The problem of delivering doctors to Appalachia and providing medical assistance—enormous good work could be done by this. In the absence of this system, which military service would be only one part of national service, I am particularly concerned to show our gratitude toward those who made a considerable sacrifice. I don't want to make it into something sordid. I think they should have served if they had been promised nothing, been paid nothing, while in service. If you have to save the country, you do whatever has to be done to save it, but having made this contribution, I feel it is the proper, generous and grateful thing for a nation to do to compensate these Vietnam veterans on precisely the same basis as the veterans of World War II were compensated.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman—there was a President from Massachusetts that said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but rather what you can do for your country," and I am saying we have that responsibility. I don't recall the veterans with whom I served—some were very anxious to do that—we sure hoped it wasn't our lot to be drawn, but if they were, they went.

Mr. DANIELSON. Do you have any further questions, Mr. Brinkley?

Mr. BRINKLEY. No.

Mr. DANIELSON. I want to call upon Mrs. Heckler in just a second. I would like to make a comment apropros the testimony of Dr. Silber. All of us have been in a war—one of our little sayings is "Hurry up and wait." Once a guy was in the service, you lost all control over your future destiny. Some guys lucked out and hit soft duty all the way through. Some had it tough from day one and some had a little of each. I don't think you had any choice—once you were in the service you were just a number and it came up whenever they were calling for numbers. I think if we did have some kind of priorities, and I recognize Mr. Huber's concept—the guy who probably paid the greatest price ought to get the greatest benefit but there ought to be a floor under that. There ought to be a minimal entitlement everybody ought to receive regardless of whether he was lucky. He may have been assigned a large mahogany desk instead of an LST, but he was taken and utilized, in whatever way. I have no objection to recognizing those who bore the real brunt of the conflict, but you know even there, there were some in the front lines, rugged, gutty, maybe weren't torn up inside any more than those who had what other people would perceive as soft duty.

If there are no more questions, I would like to recognize our most distinguished Congresswoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. Heckler, who, I also thank, for bringing Dr. Silber here. Perhaps he spoke for you, but then again, I am not so sure anybody really speaks for you.

Mrs. HECKLER. As eloquent as Dr. Silber is, I prefer to speak for myself, you are quite right. We have had extensive hearings, and I think Dr. Silber's testimony has really finally covered all aspects of the case with articulation we haven't heard before. It seems to me we are searching for equity, and I think some of the questions Mr. Huber has has raised are extremely valid, in the search for equity. Certainly, while we are all equal in terms of right, the question is, what is the exact priority that should be given to each individual, and what is the just treatment from this committee and Congress which should accord to every veteran, and certainly there are those that have given more than others. It seems to me, Dr. Silber has presented an economic analysis we have not had before, and that is the heart of the issue, in addition to this question of equity. The job market certainly does not offer the Vietnam veteran the same opportunities as the returning veteran of World War II. Unfortunately for all of us, we are in a period of economic downfall which complicates the issue. I think Dr. Silber has given us a great deal to think about. I am ready to sit down and write the bill. I thank my distinguished friend from Massachusetts. He honors us on this committee and he honors Massachusetts.

Mr. SILBER. Thank you.

Mr. DANIELSON. I want to join Mrs. Heckler in those comments. We hear a lot of testimony from fine people, but rarely should I say, do we get proposed solutions. We get a lot of problems, but very few answers, and you have given us some answers. Whether we accept them or not, I don't know. Do you have further comments, Dr. Silber?

Mr. SILBER. No.

Mr. DANIELSON. Thank you for attending and helping us on this difficult problem. We are all united in our goal. Thank you so much.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We have the honor of having with us today, Dr. Howard Holcomb, director of federal relations, National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities.

Dr. Holcomb, will you come forward?

STATEMENT OF HOWARD E. HOLCOMB, DIRECTOR OF FEDERAL RELATIONS, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. HOLCOMB. I don't know who followed Hank Aaron on that memorable occasion in Atlanta, but I appreciate how he must have felt. Dr. Silber is a tough act to follow. I am pleased to say that he represents one of our member institutions.

Mr. DANIELSON. Sometimes we find we can rise to a challenge. This is your opportunity.

Mr. HOLCOMB. I am going to go easy on the time of the committee, and, if I may, submit my statement for the record and just comment briefly.

Mr. DANIELSON. Is there any objection to the gentleman's statement appearing in the record?

There is none, and it is so included.

[The document referred to follows:]

STATEMENT OF HOWARD E. HOLCOMB, FEDERAL RELATIONS OFFICER, FOR THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES AND THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you this morning in support of a tuition payment program intended to benefit our veterans and our nation. I am Howard E. Holcomb, federal relations officer for both the Association of American Colleges and the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities. The Association of American Colleges is comprised of approximately 800 colleges and universities, five-sixths of them independent, and the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities is comprised of more than 1,000 independent colleges and universities.

Permit me first to commend this committee and the House for passing in February H.R. 12628, the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974. This bill takes a significant step toward improving veterans' benefits through an increase of 13.6% in educational assistance allowances, increasing from eight to ten years the period of time during which veterans must complete their training, reducing the disability requirements for eligibility in vocational rehabilitation, and removing the numbers of veterans assisted under the work-study program and increasing the numbers of hours a veteran may work, plus other notable advances. We recognize these achievements have been accomplished in some instances against strong opposition.

Permit me next to applaud this committee for holding special hearings on the need for tuition payments and the several members of the subcommittee who have introduced H.R. 13183 which would provide up to $600 in tuition assistance above the national average of public tuition at $419. We recognize that the pressures on this committee for a tuition payment provision are considerable. The media coverage of veterans' concerns in recent days and weeks, coinciding with Vietnam Veterans' Day, has been intense. For those reasons, as well as other relating to the ongoing burdens of your legislative assignment on this committee, we wish to express our appreciation for your tolerance in hearing our request once again. You have patiently heard our associaitons on this topic in previous years.

The national attention focused in this instance on veterans' educational benefits can be traced directly to the World War II GI Bill and its benefits. That bill transformed all higher education, if not the entire nation, and rejuvenated our entire society. It became the precursor for almost a deluge of federal education enactments—beginning with the National Defense Education Act in 1958 and continuing through the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Higher Edu-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

cation Act of 1965, the Higher Education Amendments of 1968, the Education Amendments of 1972 which began to talk in terms of "entitlement" as created by the GI Bill in 1944, and now to the Education Amendments of 1974 which recently passed the House. Those several committees of the House dealing with veterans' affairs in 1944 and in years since have pointed the way to federal legislation in higher education. The Congress, as well as state legislatures, have gained increased knowledge in subsequent years on how effectively to write such enactments.

A tuition payment should be considered first in terms of benefit to the veteran. Would a tuition payment improve the delivery system of benefits by providing equity to the veteran on a national basis, thereby eliminating or reducing any regional or state considerations which produce inequity? We believe it would, if properly designed, as the tuition payment in H.R. 13183 proposes. The veteran was called or volunteered for national service, yet the veteran tends to be treated on a state or regional basis because of varying ways in which the cost of education is financed—i.e. the amount of state tax subsidy and the resulting balance assumed by the veteran. This set of circumstances has been presented in the *Congressional Record* by many members, as well as by the report of the Educational Testing Service procured by the Veterans' Administration in response to P.L. 92-540.

When the Association of American Colleges and the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities testified before this committee in previous statements in support of a tuition payment, we pointed out that independent colleges and universities enrolled slightly more than one-half all veterans after World War II. We do not believe a tuition payment enacted now would restore that balance. Nor would we advocate that 50-50 balance in view of the fact that these colleges enroll now only 26% of degree credit students in all higher education. Interestingly, where veterans age provided a tuition payment under the vocational rehabilitation program about 28.6 percent of them enroll in independent institutions, very near the distribution pattern of all college students.

Indeed tuition charges at many public universities and colleges are high enough to depress the numbers of veterans that enroll there under the present benefit system, so that the enactment of a tuition payment as referred to above would undoubtedly permit many more veterans than are currently enrolled in those public universities and colleges to do so if they chose. The veterans' options, in any event, should be increased.

The interest of our associations in veterans is more than monetary. While it appears that the growth cycle in all education, elementary through graduate, is flattening out, independent colleges and universities have grown in the recent decades. But our growth has not included veterans. Their contribution to our campuses after World War II was their maturity and seriousness of scholastic pursuits; we do not have enough veterans these days to contribute that necessary leaven to our educational loaf. We would like to think we could contribute something also to the individual Vietnam Veteran if he or she elected to attend one of the institutions.

When we first testified before Congressional committees three years ago our colleges enrolled slightly more than 20% of the veterans in college, last year that figure was about 18%, and this year—when a new record veterans enrollment since 1951 has been achieved—we estimate it may have dropped as low as 15%. We can only estimate the percentage this year, since the latest *Information Bulletin* from the Veterans Administration (November, 1973) no longer displays percentage information by proprietary status of facility.

In an effort to attract more veterans into all higher education, as well as to independent colleges and universities in particular, our associations two academic years ago set up an outreach program with the cooperation of The American Legion. More than 600 of our colleges and universities responded to our invitation to participate, and we identified an outreach director in each of the 50 states plus two territories. Under our program a member college could sign up to receive monthly lists of discharged veterans from as many as three states of its choice. This service was provided at no cost, or in some instances only out-of-pocket costs, to our members; in addition in some states we served the entire system of public community colleges on the same basis.

We evaluated the program after the first year and learned that most colleges and states found the service of little value. In some cases it was because of the inadequacy of the lists—wrong addresses or names of persons retiring from service—but in others it was a matter of not being able to attract the veterans because of tuition charges. The program is still operating this year in about

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

one dozen states. Efforts to encourage the appropriate departments or agencies of government to enter the program, both to provide added service as well as share in the expense, have not been successful.

If tuition payments were enacted, veterans would undoubtedly be pleased. Colleges and universities, including higher cost public universities and colleges as well as independent institutions, would share that pleasure. But before that development could transpire, answers to some of the questions concerning possible abuses would need to be provided.

It is essential that the federal government concern itself with abuses in any program, inside or outside higher education. It is a tribute to the federal government, its departments and agencies, and the private sectors which relate to them that our system of government is admired around the world. In the years since the enactment and subsequent administration of the first GI Bill our nation has built a large and complex educational enterprise, and it exists today almost free of criticism about abuses.

Earlier references to abuses connected to a tuition payment in the GI Bill included exorbitant increases in tuition charges, an inadequate refund policy and false advertising practices. Under the current proposal, a $600 tuition payment would take effect only after the veteran has paid $419 from personal resources; in the independent sector where most tuitions exceed $1,000, there would be no incentive to increase tuition since no gain would accrue to the institution. Furthermore, for those public institutions with tuitions approaching $1,000, the numbers of veterans contrasted with the numbers of all other students is so small as not to permit increasing tuition charges for the entire student body. In the days following World War II veterans made up a large proportion of the student body—in independent institutions they accounted for 45% in 1947–48. Today's tuition charges are so high, in both the public and private sectors, as not to permit further increases beyond those reflecting inflation only. A frequently cited abuse under the first GI Bill, which did contain a tuition payment, dealt with the selling of books and supplies to the veteran; under the current proposal for up to $600 in tuition, books and supplies are not included, so that potential abuse is eliminated.

As for refund policies, they are fully delineated in college catalogs and are to our knowledge not the subject of misinterpretation or criticism for being inequitable. Those policies generally provide for substantial refunds during the early weeks of semesters or terms. The reason for the ultimate termination of refunds is that staff, space and resources have already been committed and expended for the full term. Special allowances for medical reasons are frequently considered on appeal.

The incidences of false advertising practices are not familiar to us as such criticisms may apply to higher education. The Veterans Administration now lists over 54,000 active facilities to which it relates in its education and training programs. The U.S. Office of Education, prior to the Education Amendments of 1972, related to under 3,000 traditional institutions of higher education, but now relates to more than 14,000 with the inclusion in 1972 of the proprietary sector in its student aid programs. This entire range of learning facilities is accountable to a large number of departments and agencies, ranging from the Federal Trade Commission to the U.S. Office of Education. By including the state approving agencies of the Veterans Administration another layer becomes involved. Most of these agencies are already involved in eliminating false advertising practices.

The veterans' educational benefits of $1.8 billion in Fiscal Year 1972 make it the largest student aid program of the federal government. Other types of federal student aid amount to $1.3 billion, and social security payments another $475 million. The fifty states currently contribute almost $400 million in student grants, while the colleges and universities themselves, both public and private, contribute another $500 million in student aid. Collectively these programs operate largely without taint of ineffective administration and subsequent abuses.

In recommending a tuition payment we are not opposing any monthly increases in current benefits. We would prefer that a tuition payment be provided in addition. At some point, however, monthly increases would lose their equity. This would happen in the situation where veterans attending some institutions or facilities receive support greatly in excess of charges, while veterans attending similar institutions receive only a portion of what they are charged. A tuition payment would assist in equalizing the opportunity and aim all federal dollars toward buying education.

We believe an improved education benefit through a tuition payment would help relieve the unsatisfactory unemployment conditions for veterans, particu-

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

larly in the crucial 20-24 age group. The latest quarterly statistics from the Department of Labor show this group to be unemployed at a 9.9% rate while nonveterans in the same age group are unemployed at a 7.6% rate. Further analysis of these latest quarterly statistics shows that 13.5% of nonveterans in the 20-24 age group are in school while only 5.6% of veterans in the same age group are in school. An improved education benefit through a tuition payment should help also in correcting this unsatisfactory ratio in the enrollment of veterans versus nonveterans.

We believe further an improved education benefit through a tuition payment might be helpful in achieving the concept of a volunteer service, particularly a volunteer Army. Meeting current manpower goals requires the volunteering of nearly one out of three qualified and available males under age 23. The quadrupling of a recruit's pay in the last decade has not yet assured the attainment of this goal. An improved education benefit through a tuition payment might cause young Americans to be more willing to trade several years of volunteered military service for a better educational opportunity after discharge.

Mr. HOLCOMB. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you this morning in support of a tuition payment program intended to benefit our veterans and our Nation. I am Howard E. Holcomb, Federal relations officer for both the Association of American Colleges and the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities. The Association of American Colleges is comprised of approximately 800 colleges and universities, five-sixths of them independent, and the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities is comprised of more than 1,000 independent colleges and universities.

I wish to applaud this committee for the actions it has already taken in reporting out H.R. 12628 containing many improvements in benefits for veterans. We also applaud the committee for holding these special hearings on H.R. 13183 which would provide up to $600 in tuition assistance above the national average of public tuition at $419. We recognize the pressures on the committee for a tuition payment provision are considerable. The media coverage of veterans' concern in recent days and weeks, coinciding with Vietnam Veterans' Day, has been intense.

The national attention focused in this instance on veterans' educational benefits can be traced directly to the World War II GI bill and its benefits, as Dr. Silber has so eloquently mentioned. The bill transformed all higher education, if not the entire Nation, and rejuvenated our entire society. We believe a tuition payment should be considered first in terms of benefit to the veteran. Would a tuition payment improve the delivery system of benefits by providing equity to the veteran on a national basis, thereby eliminating or reducing any regional or State considerations which produce inequity? We believe it would, if properly designed, as the tuition payment in H.R. 13183 proposes.

Our associations have testified before this committee and previous statements in support of a tuition payment and we appreciate your patience in hearing us again.

Three years ago, we indicated about 20 percent of the veterans were enrolled in private colleges. This year we estimate that percentage is down around 15 percent. We do not believe, if a tuition payment were enacted, that the balance of enrollment would be returned to the 50 to 50 distribution that was in effect after World War II. We do think, possibly, at the outside, veterans might enroll in public and private institutions—interestingly, where veterans are provided a tuition payment under the vocational rehabilitation program about 28.6 percent

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of them enroll in independent institutions—very near the distribution pattern of all college students.

Indeed tuition charges at many public universities and colleges are high enough to depress the numbers of veterans that enroll there under the present benefit system, so that the enactment of a tuition payment as referred to above would undoubtedly permit many more veterans that are currently enrolled in those public universities and colleges to do so if they chose. The veterans' options, in any event, should be increased.

In an effort to attract more veterans into all higher education, as well as to independent colleges and universities in particular, our associations two academic years ago set up an outreach program, with the cooperation of The American Legion. More than 600 of our colleges and universities responded to our invitation to participate, and we identified an outreach director in each of the 50 States plus two territories. Under our program a member college could sign up to receive monthly lists of discharged veterans from as many as three States of its choice. This service was provided at no cost, or in some instances only out-of-pocket costs, to our members; in addition in some States we served the entire system of public community colleges on the same basis.

We evaluated the program after the first year and learned that most colleges and States found the service of little value. In some cases it was because of the inadequacy of the lists. When veterans did come out of service after retirement they were no longer interested in college; in most cases, it was a matter of not being able to attract the veterans because of the high tuition charges.

Earlier references to abuses connected to a tuition payment in the GI bill included exorbitant increases in tuition charges, an inadequate refund policy and false advertising practices. Under the current proposal, a $600 tuition payment would take effect only after the veteran has paid $419 from personal resources; in the independent sector where most tuitions exceed $1,000, there would be no incentive to increase tuition since no gain would accrue to the institution. Furthermore, for those public institutions with tuitions approaching $1,000, the numbers of veterans contrasted with the numbers of all other students is so small as not to permit increasing tuition charges for the entire student body. In the days following World War II veterans made up a large proportion of the student body—in independent institutions they accounted for 45 percent in 1947–48. Today's tuition charges are so high in both the public and private sectors, as not to permit further increases beyond those reflecting inflation only. A frequently cited abuse under the first GI bill, which did contain a tuition payment, dealt with the selling of books and supplies to the veteran; under the current proposal for up to $600 in tuition, books and supplies are not included, so that potential abuse is eliminated.

As for refund policies, they are fully delineated in college catalogs and are to our knowledge not the subject of misinterpretation or criticism for being inequitable.

The incidences of false advertising practices are not familiar to us as such criticisms may apply to higher education as such. There are so many institutions now involved in Federal programs, and I might add they were initiated as a result of the World War II Readjustment

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Act—the U.S. Office of Education, prior to the Education Amendments of 1972, related to under 3,000 traditional institutions of higher education, but now relates to more than 14,000 with the inclusion in 1972 of the proprietary sector in its student aid programs, and for the most part the traditional institutions of higher education are without criticism for abuse or malpractice.

The veterans' educational benefits of $1.8 billion in fiscal year 1972 make it the largest student aid program of the Federal Government. Other types of Federal student aid amount to $1.3 billion, and social security payments another $475 million. The 50 States currently contribute almost $400 million in student grants, while the colleges and universities themselves, both public and private, contribute another $500 million in student aid. Collectively these programs operate largely without taint of ineffective administration and subsequent abuses.

In recommending a tuition payment we are not opposing any monthly increases in current benefits. We would prefer that a tuition payment be provided in addition. At some point, however, monthly increases would lose their equity. This would happen in the situation where veterans attending some institutions or facilities receive support greatly in excess of charges, while veterans attending similar institutions receive only a portion of what they are charged. A tuition payment would assist in equalizing the opportunity and aim all Federal dollars toward having education.

We believe an improved education benefit through a tuition payment would help relieve the unsatisfactory unemployment conditions for veterans, particularly in the crucial 20–24 age group. The latest quarterly statistics from the Department of Labor show this group to be unemployed at a 9.9 percent rate while nonveterans in the same age group to be unemployed at a 7.6 percent rate. Further analysis of these latest quarterly statistics shows that 13.5 percent of nonveterans in the 20–24 age group are in school while only 5.6 percent of veterans in the same age group are in school. An improved education benefit through a tuition payment should help also in correcting this unsatisfactory ratio in the enrollment of veterans versus nonveterans.

We believe further an improved education benefit through a tuition payment might be helpful in achieving the concept of a volunteer service, particularly a Volunteer Army. Meeting current manpower goals requires the volunteering of nearly 1 out of 3 qualified and available males under age 23. The quadrupling of a recruit's pay in the last decade has not yet assured the attainment of this goal. An improved education benefit through a tuition payment might cause young Americans to be more willing to trade several years of volunteered military service for a better educational opportunity after discharge.

With that, I conclude my testimony and thank you for your time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DANIELSON. I thank you also, Mr. Holcomb, for your contribution.

Do you have any questions, Mr. Brinkley?

Mr. BRINKLEY. I have no questions. I wish to add my appreciation to the testimony, and I appreciate hearing it.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Huber?

Mr. HUBER. I have none.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Walsh?

Mr. WALSH. No questions, just to thank Mr. Holcomb for his support, and we appreciate it very much and the time you have put into this statement. Thank you.

Mr. DANIELSON. Thank you, Mr. Holcomb. We are accumulating enough information here so I think we can come out with a bill which I think will meet today's needs.

There are no further witnesses, as I understand it. There being no other and further business to come before the committee, the subcommittee will stand adjourned until 10 tomorrow morning.

[Whereupon, at 11:45 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, May 8, 1974.]

SEPARATE TUITION PAYMENTS FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING
OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 334, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Lester L. Wolff presiding.

Mr. WOLFF. The subcommittee will come to order. I must say, we have a number of members of this subcommittee who are on their way here but instead of our delaying the opening of the hearing, we will open it at this point. A number of members of the subcommittee this morning are delayed by a little business at the House. Mr. Helstoski and Mr. Edwards and Mr. Danielson have been delayed, Mr. Edwards and Mr. Danielson by business relating to the Judiciary and although I think that is very important for them to do, I can't see anything that is more important than the legislation that is before us today. Therefore, I should like to open the hearing this morning by calling Mr. Carl Doerr, director of programs for servicemen and veterans of the American Association of Junior Colleges, who is accompanied by William Lawson, a Vietnam combat veteran. It is very good of you to come to the committee and give us the benefit of your experience. When you are ready, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF CARL H. DOERR, JR., DIRECTOR, PROGRAMS FOR SERVICE AND VETERANS, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES, ACCOMPANIED BY WILLIAM LAWSON, CONSULTANT FOR VETERANS' PROGRAMS

Mr. DOERR. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee: it is a great pleasure for my colleague, Mr William Lawson, Consultant for Veterans Programs, and myself, Carl Doerr, Director, Programs for Servicemen and Veterans, to appear here today before this distinguished subcommittee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges extends its sincere appreciation to the members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, its subcommittee on education and particularly to the distinguished chairman, Mr. Dorn and Mr. Helstoski, for the excellent legislation which the House of Representatives has recently passed.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our opinion on the variable tuition plans proposed in H.R. 11134 and H.R. 13183. We are honored to represent the American Association of Community and

Junior Colleges and its 1,200 affiliated institutions which enroll approximately one-half of our Nation's veterans in undergraduate higher education.

On July 26, 1973, this association presented testimony before the House Education Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs requesting that the House reconsider the payment of a tuition supplement to veterans. We consider these hearings a most appropriate and direct response to this request. We again thank the committee. May we briefly repeat the key portion of our testimony:

> AACJC further recommends that the committee seriously reconsider the direct payment of tuition and fees to institutions. We do not speak selfishly on this issue for our institutions stand to gain the least, perhaps even to lose, by such a provision. However, we realize that there are certain states which do not provide student veterans with low-cost tuition opportunities. Most community college graduates find that their college education at the upper division and graduate level, even at public institutions, is much more costly than at community colleges.
>
> Is it appropriate for the G.I. Bill to be the equalizing factor in providing veterans equal educational opportunities regardless of residence or academic program? Perhaps not. But, it is certainly grossly unfair for the burden of resolving the economical inequities of educational opportunities to remain solely and squarely upon the veteran. Until a better equalizing factor is devised, we recommend reconsidering the direct payment of tuition and fees to institutions.

There are three considerations involved in the proposed legislation which should be considered separately.

1. Should a variable tuition supplement be added to the basic educational entitlement received by veterans?

2. Who should receive this tuition supplement—the college or the student?

3. What would be the most feasible and appropriate formula for its distribution?

We shall address these questions in order.

1. Should a variable tuition supplement be added to the basic educational entitlement received by veterans?

AACJC favors a variable tuition supplement as proposed in the legislation under consideration for the following reasons.

The recent comparative study commissioned by the Veterans' Administration and conducted by the Educational Testing Service concludes that veterans attending college where tuition cost exceeds $419 a year are not receiving educational benefits comparable to those received following World War II. The College Entrance Examination Board conducted a national survey the results of which indicated college costs will show another sharp increase next fall. According to the survey, the most dramatic increases in average total budgets, which include tuition, room and board, transportation, and miscellaneous items, are in the private 2-year colleges. Between this year and next, costs will have increased about 27.3 percent or $701 to $3,287.

There have been many who have opposed a variable tuition supplement in the past resulting from some abuse connected with the World War II GI bill. However, we are confident that the wisdom and experience represented by this committee and staff is sufficient to design legislation which will avoid past problems. We are also aware that certain responsibilities will be placed on institutions of higher education including additional supervisions and recordkeeping to see that the program is adequately administered. It is our feeling that

these additional burdens are well worth the time and energy in order to assist veterans with their educational costs.

2. Who would receive this tuition supplement—the college or the student?

The association has previously recommended that a tuition supplement be paid directly to the colleges, primarily because of the difficulties experienced by many institutions with the PREP payments which went directly to the students. The high-level of mobility among servicemen in PREP programs led to some institutions losing thousands of dollars.

However, we wish to emphasize that this is not a major concern and the association would consider the provisions of the Walsh-Wolff proposal on this issue satisfactory. The committee may wish to allow a system similar to the present advance payment system where the check in the student's name goes directly to the college.

3. What would be the most feasible and appropriate formula for its distribution?

H.R. 11134 provides for a tuition supplement of up to $600 when tuition costs for an ordinary school year exceed $419.

This appears to be a feasible formula, hardly adequate to meet tuition costs at most private colleges; but certainly it is a generous assistance. The committee may wish to address the following questions in establishing the intent of the legislation.

Is the student who has completed three quarters during "an ordinary school year" entitled to an additional tuition supplement if he attends a fourth quarter during a calendar year?

What would be the maximum tuition supplement "bonus" to which he would be entitled for that fourth quarter?

Must the tuition supplement be equally divided between two semesters or three quarters or may a veteran choose to receive most or all of his tuition supplement in any one term providing he otherwise qualifies?

AACJC concludes its testimony by voicing the following concerns:

1. A variable tuition supplement must not in any way jeopardize the higher basic benefits already approved by the House.

2. Such a program should be carefully designed and approved with sufficient lead time so that the Veterans Administration can design appropriate implementation measures.

Mr. Wolff, we appreciate the opportunity to present testimony this morning and would welcome any questions that you might have.

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you for a very comprehensive statement. Mr. Lawson, would you like to add anything to what Mr. Doerr has already said.

Mr. LAWSON. No, sir. I feel Mr. Doerr has included everything in his statement, although I would like to put some emphasis on the fact we are deeply concerned with the fact of possible compromise, or what have you, as a result of this tuition provision. We do not want to see the level of benefits that now exist in the present legislation decline in any way as a result of this provision.

Mr. WOLFF. There is some conflict that exists right now in the House, as you know. To the rest of us, I think that is very important. We are pushing with all of the energies at our command to see to it that the cutoff, or the extension, I should say, of the program is facil-

itated so people do not get cut off in the middle of the program. That is the Senate part of the bill to ours. However, there is the thought, while we are doing this, we might eliminate the tuition portions of the bills we have just discussed, and I want to assure you, whatever we try to do, those of us who are the original sponsors of this legislation, is to see to it that this comes out as a special piece of legislation this year and not put it off to another year, so one will not interfere with the other.

I don't want you to go away from here feeling we are going to accept any compromises, those of us who have been very strong in promoting this legislation.

One element here that has been a cause of concern, as you know, the Veterans' Administration has indicated that they do not support this bill. Maybe with the change of Administrator, we will get a change of heart on their part. However, I would indicate to you that the major reaction they had was the fact it was going to be inflationary, cost factors involved. Have you given any consideration to the costs you think this would add to the education program already available to veterans on an overall basis?

Mr. DOERR. We have not addressed ourselves to any cost analysis of such a provision. We realize that it will call for additional appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. We also realize in times of inflation, particularly with the costs of tuition and books and fees increasing, that the subsistence allowance of $250 or even the Senate recommendations of $270, just will not make it possible for veterans to remain in school or for many of them to begin school.

Certainly, the community colleges have helped out because of their low tuition, or no tuition, but we are also limiting then the possibilities for veterans to go into higher education by closing off a very important segment of private schools, both 2 and 4 years, and some high cost public colleges and universities.

Mr. WOLFF. I said this before at other meetings we have had here, other hearings—that it seems strange one branch of our Government considers the cost of this type of assistance to be inflationary, and yet these are the people who went to Vietnam to help save this country, and yet we are willing to spend 3 to 6 hundred million dollars a year to help them with their inflation. It seems kind of an inordinate emphasis upon one element of priorities and not upon another.

I thank both of you for appearing here. If there is anything else you would like to add, we will be happy to receive it. Thank you for your support of this legislation. As you have indicated in your statement there is the fact that you may not directly benefit by this proposal. It is something you are certainly to be congratulated for because it will contribute toward the welfare of all of the veterans and not just your own schools. We thank you very much.

Mr. DOERR. Thank you.

Mr. WOLFF. Our second witness this morning is Mr. Roney Hartley, National Service and Legislative Director of AMVETS.

Mr. Hartley, you may proceed. I take it you are accompanied by someone else here. Please identify him.

STATEMENT OF RONEY HARTLEY, NATIONAL SERVICE AND LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR OF AMVETS, ACCOMPANIED BY THOMAS E. HORNER, NATIONAL SERVICE OFFICER (AMVETS)

Mr. HARTLEY. I would like to introduce Mr. Tom Horner, our new National Service Officer that has joined our staff. He is a disabled Vietnam veteran, and I wanted him to appear before you today, and Tom will be assisting veterans in this area directly.

I have an article I would like to later read to you from "The Retired Officer". It is printed in the May issue. I will insert this, with your approval, later on in the testimony.

Mr. WOLFF. Without objection, it will be received.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman and members of this subcommittee: AMVETS appreciates the opportunity to appear before this distinguished subcommittee to present the views of our organization on this vital legislation.

The importance of developing and upgrading meaningful educational and training programs will be demonstrated by the long range effects they will have on an individual's ability in securing gainful and productive employment.

Since many Vietnam era veterans, eligible for VA educational assistance have families, the continuing increase in cost for books, tuition, supplies, and living expenses, make it most difficult for them to utilize their earned entitlement.

The problem is that inflation has taken its toll by minimizing the increases as fast as they become available, and millions of Vietnam era veterans find themselves severely limited when trying to get a college education.

Accordingly, it would appear that certain adjustments are necessary in order to carry out more fully the basic intent of these important benefits.

AMVETS strongly believe that a veteran should attend the college, or institution of his choice, for academic reasons, not financial ones.

Although the Vietnam era veteran received more money, it buys less; from the $220 currently paid to a full-time veteran with no dependents, he must pay a tuition, living expenses, books, and general maintenance.

Skyrocketing tuition costs have reduced the GI bill payments drastically, and according to recent reports, only 1.5 percent of the entering freshman at those institutions were veterans. Veterans are being pushed into 2 year community colleges, vocational schools, and on the-job training endeavors. Most married veterans are being supported by working wives as they try to get their education.

It should be pointed out that these same veterans attending college are also having to work either full or part time, while living in the low income districts, in order to make family ends meet.

Admittedly, veterans are benefiting heavily from the GI bill, with a somewhat higher percentage than World War II participation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Since 1970, over 4 million servicemen have been discharged from the military, and it seems only fitting that these returning veterans be given the opportunity to attend their selected college.

It is in this respect that AMVETS supports H.R. 11134 since it calls for a variable tuition allowance, due to variances in the States with GI bill participation rates and the availability of low-cost education; while creating parity for Vietnam era veterans in relation to the educational benefits administered to those of World War II.

Since H.R. 11134 would allow the veteran to receive the tuition assistance, and not the institution, we believe that any possible abuses associated with the post-World War II GI bill would be eliminated, while including provisions for further enhancing all of the other educational programs.

At this time, I would like to insert the article from "The Retired Officer," by Col. Minter L. Wilson, Jr., U.S. Army (retired). His article is entitled, "Prisoners of Peace," and I quote:

> Many of our Vietnam veterans are now prisoners of peace. They still fight to survive—for jobs, decent housing, education and training. More than 288,000 are jobless. They need the education and training promised by the GI Bill in order to qualify for suitable employment. Too many get "Jobs for Vets". Translated that means security guard, messenger, janitor or—for a job with "upward mobility"—elevator operator. They are caught in a paradoxical circle. They need good education and training to obtain a decent job; yet without a job to supplement inadequate GI Bill benefits, they cannot even survive let alone obtain the necessary education and training.
>
> In our eagerness to forget an admittedly unpopular war, we have erased from our minds and consciences the veteran who carried out his thankless task with inadequate homefront support.
>
> Many leaders in business and industry today know deep down that it was the GI Bill which gave them their opportunity. Tuition and fees were paid and there was $75 per month for subsistence in addition. Over 7 million WW II veterans took advantage of it. Unhappily, too many of these veterans—now successful business men—are able to ignore the plight of the returning Vietnam-era serviceman. Today $75 doesn't sound like much but it was more than 35 percent of the average monthly wage in 1948. The $220 paid a single veteran in school now is only only 26 percent of today's average monthly earnings and the vet is supposed to pay all costs from that.
>
> Perhaps the attitude of the country is really our biggest problem. We need a resurgence of national compassion and conscience.

In this ever-changing social and economic American society, the dedicated actions of this committee in the interests of the American veteran and his dependents continues to be their greatest assurance of a life with honor and dignity, one which will allow them to make their contribution to the best of their capacities, for the peace, welfare, and continued growth of our great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, AMVETS firm belief has been demonstrated: That any Federal investment in the training and education of our Nation's veterans and dependents is a wise and prudent investment in America.

Thank you.

Mr. Wolff. We thank you very much for your statement. It certainly zeros in on the problem as it exists. I wonder if you would care to comment on the Veterans' Administration.

You indicated, in your statement, that although the money would be allocated to the individual veterans, you felt that many of the abuses that existed before would still be apparent today. In other words, in reality, they didn't trust the individual. Would you care to comment?

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. HARTLEY. We would like to comment on this. We believe that most of the problems that occurred after World War II were on the educational institutions themselves. We believe the veteran, getting the tuition payments, we can trust him. If we can't trust him, I don't think he should be getting the educational allowance at all. Our committee in the national constitutional bylaws, we will push that the veteran should continue to get the allowance himself along with the tuition allowances, and let him pay the school, and in that respect we disagree with the Veterans' Administration entirely.

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you.

Mr. Walsh?

Mr. WALSH. Thank you, Mr. Hartley. It is not an unusual position for many veterans organizations to disagree with the Veterans' Administration. It is not an unusual position for this committee, either, Mr. Hartley, I assure you.

Mr. HARTLEY. In the past few months we have had quite a few disagreements with the Veterans' Administration. Hopefully, we will have an upward trend in working relationships with any new administrator that is appointed, and we are hopeful we will have one that will push for this type of payments, also.

Mr. WALSH. We are very grateful for your support, Mr. Hartley, and I just want to issue a word of caution here. Just about everybody we have had appear before this committee has supported what the committee is trying to do, trying to equalize the benefits for the Vietnam era veteran with the veteran of World War II and the Korean era. Sometimes, we get a little complacent, I fear. The unfortunate part about it is some of the people who may be opposed to what we are trying to do are not always present or always here to hear this testimony. I would urge you to do everything you can to communicate your feelings on this to the other Members of the Congress who are not members of this committee, to other veteran organizations, and continue to develop support for this legislation. I think it is absolutely necessary if we are going to get the type of support necessary to pass this legislation. Thank you very much.

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you, Mr. Walsh.

Any further comments you would like to make?

Mr. HARTLEY. None, at this time.

Mr. WOLFF. Again, we thank you for coming before the subcommittee and for your support for this legislation. I just want to underline what my colleague, Mr. Walsh, has indicated. Mr. Walsh has displayed the foresight to have this information before the subcommittee, and I would say that some opposed to this legislation are operating in the shadows, and I think we have to put it out.

The next witness is Mr. Frank E. G. Weil, national secretary of AVC. Mr. Weil has evidently been delayed, and his statement, without objection, will be placed in the record as though read.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF MR. FRANK E. G. WEIL, NATIONAL SECRETARY, THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE (AVC)

Mr. WEIL. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, the American Veterans Committee welcomes this opportunity to testify on behalf of more realistic legislation to provide adequate educational benefits for Vietnam-era veterans. Many of AVC's members used the World War II GI Bill and the Korean GI Bill,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and are now using the present bill. Particularly our World War II members benefited greatly from the first GI Bill and achieved their professional status and accomplishments as a direct result of that Bill.

AVC, as you know, has a unique philosophy for a veterans organization "citizens first, veterans second." Our basic philosophy has always been that the chief purpose of a veterans benefits program should be the rehabilitation and integration of veterans into the civilian society, and we have consistently supported legislation that would achieve these goals. AVC believes the nation has an obligation to assist the citizen soldier in taking his place in the civilian society from whence he came.

The GI Bill enacted during World War II was one of the most imaginative programs ever devised, and its success is written on the pages of our history. What it did for the veterans and for the nation can never be totally evaluated, but the monies invested in that program have been repaid to the nation many times over. Many of its programs were models for later important social and welfare legislation that is now the law of the land.

On the 25th Anniversary of the GI Bill, (1969) General Omar Bradley stated in a moving tribute:

"The World War II GI Bill was an investment in human beings * * * It has paid unparalleled dividends just as the current GI Bill is already doing for our young veterans of today * * *

"In the GI Bill, Congress offered the veterans a valuable stake in themselves. They took heart in the knowledge that the nation stood ready to back their civilian chances in making good. Veterans wanted only the fair chance to become self-supporting, self-sufficient, self-respecting American citizens * * *

AVC supported: GI Bill for Korean veterans, for a Cold War GI Bill, and we have urged an adequate and realistic Vietnam Veterans GI Bill. We also called for enactment of PREP, Tutorial Assistance and new innovative programs to encourage utilization of the GI Bill.

The American Veterans Committee once more urges the enactment of new legislation this session of Congress to provide needed readjustment assistance to the returning Vietnam veterans. In light of the rising costs of living and education, it is essential to correct the current situation which discriminates against the Vietnam veterans and does not give them adequate benefits or programs to resume their places as productive citizens in our society. Also the country's desire to forget the Vietnam tragedy makes it more imperative for the nation not to forget the Vietnam-era veterans who served in that unpopular war.

In the area of educational benefits, the AVC supports a GI Bill comparable to the one after World War II, which benefited a generation of veterans, including many of our own members, and had an enormous impact on the nation itself. The recent study by the Educational Testing Service (September 1973) pointed out that, as a result of rising education costs and variations in state educational programs, Vietnam-era veterans have fewer educational alternatives open to them than veterans under the World War II GI Bill. Moreover, those veterans who need the benefits most—the undereducated, the disadvantaged, many of whom come from minority groups—are the ones who take least advantage of the programs. Because of the wide variations in tuition levels and availability of differing educational options in various states, geographic discrimination also prevails. To help counteract this situation AVC urges that as a condition for eligibility for veteran student tuition payments, public colleges which have a two-tier tuition system for residents and non-residents (and any private colleges which have the same system) be required to admit veteran students on the GI Bill at the resident student rate.

Furthermore, we support a substantial rise in benefit payments to Vietnam veterans to a level commensurate with the World War II benefits. AVC endorses a system of separate allowances for educational costs, as well as a subsistence allowance to be paid to the veteran.

The arguments of the Veterans Administration that the current GI Bill provides the same benefits as did the World War II GI Bill do not hold up under scrutiny. As Congressman Walsh pointed out in his testimony to a House subcommittee last week, the Consumer Price Index is not an accurate instrument of comparison of dollar worth. If the percentage of average U.S. monthly earnings is used, then the World War II $75 living allowance is equivalent to $220 today. That $220 represents the *total living and educational* allowance provided by the current GI Bill to the Vietnam veteran. The rise in educational costs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

since 1945 staggers the imagination. It is from two to five times as much depending on the kind of institution. The ETS study concluded that "the 'real value' of the educational allowance available to veterans of World War II was greater than the current allowance being paid to veterans of the Vietnam conflict when adjustments are made for the payment of tuition, fees, books, and supplies."

The VA has pointed t almost equal rates of participation in the World War II and Vietnam-era GI Bills. But it neglects the important fact that proportionately many more young people are college-bound today than were in 1945; therefore, the participation rate for Vietnam veterans should be significantly greater.

The current proposal in S2789 and in HR11131, providing an educational allowance up to $600, is a step in the right direction. While this additional $600 educational allowance would still not give the veteran the freedom of choice of institutions the World War II veteran had, it would open up many more options to him among the public colleges and universities. Therefore, we support this provision for a supplementary $600 tuition allowance, which is before this committee. However, we still do not believe it brings the Vietnam veteran to parity with the World War II veteran, which should be the goal of any Vietnam-era GI Bill of Rights.

The GI Bill legislation should not only raise educational benefits but should also make it unnecessary to pass new legislation every time the cost of living rises. There should be a clause tying the amount of the education benefit to the "cost of living;" by "cost of living" we do not mean the COL published by the Department of Labor (although that COL would be an important factor in the calculation); we mean a special "cost of living" figure calculated for the specific purpose of insuring that veterans enrolling in schools receive relatively the same benefits over time. The cost of living for, say, the Midwest farmer may include ingredients which are not relevant to the bulk of the veterans attending educational institutions, whereas it would not include as a significant factor the cost of tuition, fees and books at the various kinds of educational institutions. The principle inherent in calculating the Department of Labor COL should be applied to the particular situation of the veteran student, and the "cost of living" for educational benefit purposes should be determined accordingly.

In order that more veterans be able to avail themselves of the GI Bill, we support an extension of the entitlement period beyond the current eight years stipulation. When new legislation increasing the benefits is enacted, entitlement should begin then, since many veterans simply could not use GI benefits under the current system. To insure that the GI Bill would be used by those who need it most, the outreach programs of the VA should be increased and include contracting out to those groups working with veterans to stimulate increased awareness among veterans of available programs, particularly among disadvantaged groups.

AVC also urges an expanded work-study program so that more veterans who need to work while going to school can use their educational benefits. More programs such as the Emergency Employment Act should be devised to encourage the split-job concept and provide veterans with the part-time employment they need while going to school. We also urge the setting up of a low-cost loan program to help veterans continue their schooling.

Another instance of discrimination against Vietnam veterans has come to our attention which needs the action of this committee. We understand that there are companies which provide educational allowances for their employees to further their education or increase their skills, but have refused to give these allowances to their employees who are veterans eligible for the GI Bill. We believe that this is an illegal practice, since the GI Bill represents earned benefits. We urge the committee to include an amendment in the bill it reports out to make it illegal for an employer to deny to veterans educational allowances it provides its non-veteran employees, on the basis that the veterans already have their GI Bill educational benefits.

We would like to call to the attention of this committee a group of veterans that has been of great concern to the American Veterans Committee—the over 200,000 veterans who have received less-than-honorable discharges. These vets have, in fact, been barred from using their educational benefits, as well as other veterans benefits, by the regulations and administrative policies of the Veterans Administration. By statute, only veterans who have served under "dishonorable conditions" are barred from receiving benefits, but the VA has chosen to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

interpret this provision to include many individuals who receive discharges "under conditions other than honorable." As a result, thousands of veterans are being prohibited from using GI Bill benefits which they have earned and to which they are entitled. These veterans need the educational benefits even more than their fellow veterans, since their discharges carry a stigma which makes it difficult for them to obtain employment and to enter training programs.

We urge this committee to provide educational benefits to those 200,000 veterans who received Undesirable and Bad Conduct Discharges (from special court-martials). We propose a provision in any legislation reported out by this committee that would prohibit the VA from denying educational benefits to any veterans except those who received "Dishonorable Discharges." The recently enacted "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act" of December 1973 (P.L. 93-203), contains the following provision:

SEC. 205 (c)(5) Veterans, Special Consideration. ". . . that special consideration in filling transitional public service jobs will be given to unemployed persons who served in the Armed Forces in Indochina or Korea on or after August 5, 1964, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary (and who have received other than dishonorable discharges)."

If the federal government does not bar employment to veterans with less-than-honorable discharges, it is certainly an injustice to bar them from their GI Bill benefits. We urge this committee to use the model of this Comprehensive Employment and Training Act and write a similar prohibition into a revised Vietnam-era GI Bill.

We thank the committee for this opportunity to present our suggestions in the important matters before you.

Mr. WOLFF. Next is the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Francis W. Stover, national legislative director. Francis, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS W. STOVER, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. STOVER. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the privilege of appearing before this subcommittee to present the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars regarding this legislation of intense concern to Vietnam veterans attending or who plan to attend high cost colleges and universities.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has adhered to the principle that readjustment and educational assistance for Vietnam veterans should be comparable to assistance provided veterans of previous wars. As a practical matter, when the question of comparability of readjustment assistance for Vietnam veterans is discussed, the program being compared is the assistance provided World War II veterans.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is proud of its role in creating the original GI bill of rights enacted to help World War II veterans readjust to civil life after having been in the military service up to 5 years. The making up for lost time spent in the Armed Forces is the rationale for readjustment assistance for Vietnam veterans.

In that regard, the Veterans of Foreign Wars commends this subcommittee for developing and recommending the veterans education and rehabilitation amendments of 1974—H.R. 12628—which was unanimously approved by the House by a vote of 382 to 0 on February 19, 1974. H.R. 12628 contains a 13.6-percent increase in the rates and other improvements in the present GI bill, which will go a long way toward achieving comparable readjustment assistance for Vietnam veterans.

This subcommittee chose to postpone action on H.R. 11134 and similar bills, since such proposals might have served to hold up expeditious

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

consideration and action by the full House for the badly needed GI bill rate increase in H.R. 12628.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, therefore, commends this subcommittee for your vital role in having VA educational programs up to date and in line with our ever-changing society.

It is our ever-changing society which has caused much of the anguish and confusion regarding what is meant by comparable GI bill benefits. The Vietnam veteran who attends school on the east coast is generally confronted with a higher tuition rate than veterans attending schools at land-grant colleges further west and public educational institutions in general in States like California. The $1,980 a year which a single veteran receives while in full-time training does not begin to be adequate to cover the high cost of tuition, board and room, books, and fees.

Veterans of World War II were entitled up to $500 for educational costs plus a modest subsistence allowance. The authorized $700 covered educational costs for the majority of World War II veterans.

H.R. 11134 and similar bills address themselves to this nagging problem for so many Vietnam veterans. The approach in these bills is to provide an option for thousands of veterans who presently find it impossible to even consider going to high-cost schools.

In the interest of providing the widest possible readjustment assistance, this subcommittee should give favorable consideration to these proposals before you. Passage of one of these bills with the built-in safeguards to prevent abuses in the administration of the assistance provided therein, will be extremely helpful in aiding thousands of veterans to achieve their fullest potential and thereby make a greater contribution to the Nation in civil life.

Most important, a veteran who is quickly and successfully readjusted generally does not call upon the Veterans' Administration for assistance in the years ahead. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, therefore, commends Congressman Walsh for having this legislation thoroughly considered by this subcommittee and for his leadership in focusing national attention on this problem of the high cost of tuition, books, and fees for Vietnam veterans.

Mr. Chairman, it will be appreciated if a copy of the mandate of the Veterans of Foreign Wars which supports the purpose and intent of this legislation, identified as V.F.W. Resolution No. 693, entitled "Improve Benefits for Vietnam Veterans," be made a part of my testimony.

Mr. WALTER. Without objection, the resolutions will be placed in the record at this point.

[The resolution follows:]

(Resolution No. 693, adopted at the 74th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held in New Orleans, Louisiana, August 17 through 24, 1973.)

IMPROVE BENEFITS FOR VIETNAM VETERANS

Whereas, the Vietnam veteran is as much a veteran as the World War II and Korean veterans; and

Whereas, the Vietnam veteran is not receiving Educational benefits comparable to those received by World War II veterans; and

Whereas, the Vietnam veteran is not eligible for Business loans or Insured loans as the World War II and Korean Veterans are; and

Whereas, the Vietnam veteran is not being properly informed of his benefits before being discharged from Active Service; now, therefore

Be it resolved, by the 74th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that we do everything in our power to help the Vietnam veteran procure all Veterans Benefits which Veterans of other Wars are entitled to, and that we try to get a better "Benefits Course" established to properly inform the returning Veteran of his benefits before he is discharged, so he can better determine his course of action concerning Veteran Benefits after being discharged; and

Be it further resolved, That the Vietnam veteran receive Tuition, Cost of Books and Allotment Comparable to Veterans of World War II, and

Be it further resolved, That we seek legislation to this end, and propose and actively work for a Federal Law to accomplish this result, since time is of the essence as many Vietnam veterans are now in a family way, and immediate action is imperative.

Mr. STOVER. Thank you for the privilege of appearing before this subcommittee to present the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on this legislation of extreme importance to thousands of Vietnam veterans.

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you, Francis. We always appreciate your assistance.

Since there are no further witnesses to appear before the committee this morning, we will adjourn until the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 10:45 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned until the call of the Chair.]

○